CROZER QUARTERLY

Volume XXVII April, 1950 Number 2

MOTIFS OF OLD TESTAMENT MIRACLES

JAMES B. PRITCHARD

Crozer Theological Seminary

IN THE BOOK of Deuteronomy frequent reference is made to the "signs and wonders" [1] which were performed by God. Clearly the allusion is to the marvels which God wrought through Moses and Aaron in Egypt. These wonders, the author maintains, evidence the greatness of the God of Israel. So deeply imbedded in the popular tradition were the stories of a miraculous nature that the Deuteronomic editor did not feel it necessary to detail them. Suffice, it would, to mention the widely used phrase "signs and wonders," which served as a label for a definite type of miracle story, long a part of folk tradition. In some narratives the agent was the deity himself; in others it was an angel who did the wonder; but in the greater number of stories it was a human being who served as an agent of God in working the miracle. The event itself attested the divine power; it was a sign that the god was indeed present. From the use of the word *ōth* (sign) in Deuteronomy and elsewhere[2] it is clear that in the Hebrew mind there was a sharply defined category for a kind of marvelous event which was generally recognized as evidence for the power and presence of the deity.

This sensitiveness to revelation through miracle did not spring from an ignorance of the laws of nature or of causation. The very fact that the story of the floating iron was told to honor the prophet makes it clear that the average Israelite knew that iron was heavier—always heavier—than water. Miracles cannot be brushed aside with the remark that the ancient Israelite was ignorant of the laws of nature. Had he been, miracle stories would have been quite pointless. The more one believed in the regularity of the natural order, the more effective the miracle story was to sustain a faith in a god who was over and above the laws of the universe.

A listing of the miraculous stories of the Old Testament reveals at once certain centres about which this type of material gravitated. Some figures are generously adorned by miracle stories; others, equally prominent, are described in quite realistic terms. Is it possible to account for this

[1] Deut. 4:34; 6:22; 7:19; 26:8; 29:2; 34:11.

[2] It appears seventy-eight times in the Old Testament, but in some instances it has a slightly different meaning.

preference of some pictures for the more colorful, popular legend, and to explain the more rigorous realism which characterizes other portraits of historical figures? This is one problem with which a student of the miracles must deal.

When one seeks to fit the motifs of biblical folklore into a general index of folkloristic motifs, such as that of Stith Thompson,[3] he cannot help but notice the restricted range of the motifs of the biblical tradition. So narrow is the range of themes that one is led to believe that a definite canon of motifs existed. Within the banks of this channel the tradition was confined. What, then, are the motifs of the miracle stories of the Old Testament? What light do these motifs throw upon the social background not only of those who told the stories but of those more modest people who constituted the audience for the teller? The analysis of the miracles presented here makes no pretense of being comprehensive; rather it seeks to suggest an avenue of approach which may serve to shed light on the patterns of thought which molded theology. First, then, let us inquire into the points of concentration for the stories.

Miracle stories seem to cluster most thickly about the character of Moses. Our sources for the foremost figure in Israelite tradition are found in a text containing layers from almost a thousand years of story-telling. Legend, fable, phantasy, fact were combined into different configurations at various periods of this long process of transmission to do service to many ideas and institutions. To attempt to unravel the threads of this tapestry of the founder of Israel's religion has been the challenging, but baffling, task of several generations of critics. We shall attempt neither to summarize nor to appraise their labors—although any careful student must reckon with the strata of the tradition; rather, we shall point to some of the miraculous elements which gravitated at one time or another to this character, known as he is only by glimpses through the stained glass of worshiping generations.

An early story[4] recounts how Moses first discovered the dwelling place of Yahweh. Discovery came through an unnatural sight, a bush—here there is an obvious pun on "bush" (*sĕnē*) and Sinai (*sīnay*), the mountain of Yahweh—which burned but was not consumed. Fire, so frequently the subject of legend, is also the evidence for the divine presence in the call of Gideon.[5] whose offering for Yahweh was miraculously consumed by a fire set off when the staff of the angel of the Lord touched the rock. Apparently Manoah encountered the same fire of Yahweh as he

[3] *Motif-Index of Folk-Literature*, 6 vols., Helsinki, 1932.

[4] Exod. 3:2-5. For a commentary on the Moses tradition see H. Gressmann, *Mose und seine Zeit*, Göttingen, 1913.

[5] Judg. 6:11-21.

and his remarkably sane wife looked on the burning sacrifice.[6] These three miracle stories suffice to suggest that there must have been some well-established connection between a miraculous fire and the presence of a divine being.

Early in the present collection of stories told of Moses appears the story of the miracle-working rod of the leader. Moses has but to cast it upon the ground and it becomes a serpent.[7] Again a story in the present text about Aaron and his rod—but probably originally about Moses—tells of a contest between the Hebrew leader and the Egyptian wonder-workers.[8] The Hebrew casts his rod, which is metamorphized into a kind of serpent—perhaps a crocodile. Momentarily the reader is alarmed as the Egyptians duplicate the miracle. But the fear is speedily dispelled when the serpent of the Hebrew wonder-worker eats up the serpents of the other contestants. This is indeed a *Schauwunder,* designed to interest, as well as to convince, the folk audience.

The leader who, according to the story, was reluctant to trust his newly found powers had worked for him another wonder. Yahweh made his hand turn leprous when put into his bosom; by a similar gesture it was restored.[9] The same motif of an afflicted hand appears in a story concerning a nameless prophet from Judah. He had come to Jeroboam at Bethel; after castigating the king for participating in the idolatrous cult there, the prophet gave Jeroboam a sign. Jeroboam's hand was instantly dried up. Upon the request of the frightened king the prophet prayed and immediately the hand was restored.[10]

Equipped with wonder-working powers Moses is pictured as seeking to convince Pharaoh to release the Israelites for a three-day journey into the wilderness to worship Yahweh. There are six major miracles and plagues, to which have been added enlargements at various stages in the growth of the tradition. As an example of the way in which various details were added in transit, the miracle of the turning of the Nile into blood[11] will do service. There are convincing evidences[12] that the earliest layer depicts a mythological scene in which it is Yahweh himself who smites the Nile with his rod to turn it into blood. Later, the agent is Moses and the instrument is Moses' rod. In the priestly layer of the story it is Aaron whose rod effects the transformation. This time not merely the river but streams, pools, ponds, and the water in wooden and stone vessels are turned into blood. Yet another addition to the once simple miracle pictures the Egyptians digging for water round about the river.

There follows the plague of frogs,[13] at first attributed to Moses; later,

[6] Judg. 13:2-20.
[7] Exod. 4:2-5.
[8] Exod. 7:8-13.
[9] Exod. 4:6-7.
[10] I Kings 13:1-6.
[11] Exod. 7:14-25.
[12] Chiefly verses 17 and 25.
[13] Exod. 7:26–8:11.

to Aaron. Third is the plague of swarming flies, which are able to distinguish between an Egyptian and a Hebrew.[14] This major plague is preceded by a later duplicate, a plague of gnats.[15] The plague of a disease on the cattle destroys all the cattle of the Egyptians.[16] Parallel to this is a plague of boils which appear on man and beast. This widespread infection was induced by Moses throwing heavenward soot from the furnace. The popular character of the story is attested by the coarse humor of a situation in which the Egyptian magicians were so afflicted with boils that they could not even stand before Moses to vie with him.

In the present arrangement of the text there follows the story of the hail and storm.[17] Although in the previous plague all the cattle of the Egyptians had died, Moses offers Pharaoh the chance to save his cattle by corralling them before the storm breaks. Here Moses, like Elijah, is pictured as able to produce a storm— devastating enough to smite most of the crops of the Egyptians, sparing, of course, the spelt and the wheat, needed as they were for the celebration of the Passover soon to take place. The hail was brought on by extending the magic staff heavenward; it ceased when Moses extended his hands to Yahweh. The sixth plague is that of locusts.[18] Here an east wind does the bidding of Yahweh and carries the insects to the land of Egypt. As an intrusion into the general scheme is the remarkable miracle of the three days of darkness[19] inflicted upon the Egyptians but not upon the Israelites.

To the six plagues was added another—perhaps, fitting the entire episode of the deliverance into the highly favored number seven—the death of the first-born. It is not unlikely that this story may have had a historical basis: the death of the crown prince of Egypt, an incident which could easily have been interpreted as a punishment from Yahweh. Later, under the influence of the Passover tradition, requiring the death of the first-born of the Hebrews' cattle as a substitute for the first-born of their sons, it was felt that the Egyptians should not be spared this sacrifice. Thus, it may well be that the story grew to include in it the first-born of all the Egyptians as well as the death of the heir of the king.

Here are, indeed, wonderful stories connected with Moses. With the exception of the earliest stratum of the seventh plague, none has a naturalistic explanation which could serve to explain the starting point of the exaggeration. Perhaps at the base of most of these miracle stories lies a legendary, or mythological, or magical, foundation, but one which, as yet, is not apparent to us. The efforts of some of the nineteenth-century commentators to find explanations in nature for these stories remain only

[14] Exod. 8:16-28.
[15] Exod. 8:12-15 (P).
[16] Exod. 9:1-7 (J).
[17] Exod. 9:13-35.
[18] Exod. 10:1-20.
[19] Exod. 10:21-29.

as a curiosity.[20] The stories are a tribute to the genius of a long line of storytellers.

Once freed from Egyptian bondage, the Hebrews encountered a new set of problems. Having gone from an irrigation culture into a desert, they were faced with the problem of water. Four different stories, each a place saga, tell how water was miraculously provided by Yahweh—through the instrument of Moses' rod in three cases, and in the fourth through "wood" magic. At Marah[21] there was water, but it was bitter. Yahweh instructed Moses to sweeten it by means of wood.[22] The springs at three other places, Massah, Meribah,[23], and Kadesh,[24] according to the local sagas incorporated into the Mosaic material, had had their origins at the miraculous touch of Moses' rod. The larger supply of water at Kadesh was explained by the story that Moses had smitten the rock twice with his rod, thus producing a double portion. Not only Moses, but also Samson got water to quench his thirst when God "cleaved the hollow place that is in Lehi." [25] If Moses could produce water to drink, he could provide food just as miraculously. For the hungry Israelites God provided manna[26] upon hearing the prayer of Moses. Quails, too, were provided when the monotonous diet of the sweet manna became unbearable. Thus we have a set of miracles collected about the theme of the leader's provision for every need of the wanderers.

An etiological story told to explain the origin of an altar—possibly at Kadesh—describes the miracle wrought by Moses' rod in Rephidim.[27] The altar bore the name, "Yahweh is my banner" (or staff). Why? As long as Moses held up the staff of Yahweh, it sent forth powerful emanations, infusing the distant Israelite host with courage and strength. It is not unlikely that the banner of Yahweh had as its symbol a serpent.

Another cultic saga is that of the healing which was effected by looking upon the bronze serpent.[28] This, too, is etiological in the sense that it was told to explain the presence of an actual object[29] in the cult of a later period. The basis for the original story could well have been a belief in sympathetic magic: when people were bitten by poisonous serpents they could be healed by gazing on a bronze representation of the very creature which had poisoned them.

Several of the miracles incorporated in the Moses collection deal with unsuccessful attempts to challenge the religious authority of Moses. They seem to indicate that there were revolts on the part of the laity. The

[20] A. Dillmann, *Die Bücher Exodus und Leviticus*, 3rd. ed., Leipzig, 1897, pp. 88-90, for example.
[21] Exod. 15:22-26.
[22] *Cf.* II Kings 2:19 ff.
[23] Exod. 17:1-7.
[24] Numb. 20:1-13.
[25] Judg. 15:17-19.
[26] Exod. 16 and Numb. 11.
[27] Exod. 17:8-16.
[28] Numb. 21:4-9.
[29] See II Kings 18:4.

stories are: the strange fire of Nadab and Abihu,[30] the place saga of Taberah,[31] and the story of the sons of Korah.[32] The latter, enlarged upon in successive layers, is probably but a duplicate of the Nadab and Abihu story. In each of these there came about the miraculous destruction of those who dared to oppose the god-given authority of Moses. A belief in religious authority supplies the basis for the story of the miraculous budding of Aaron's rod,[33] a theme which was used extensively in the ancient world.[34] This miracle story attested, at one stage of its development, the connection of Levi (Moses) with the cult. Later—perhaps at the time of Solomon, when the Zadokite priesthood came into power—Aaron was substituted for Moses. These four stories, magical as they are in their plots, serve the historian of religion well in supplying concrete evidence for the thesis that religious authority was not achieved without considerable opposition on the part of rival groups. Stories of miraculous intervention frequently served to vindicate the authority of existing leadership within the cult and to preserve the *status quo* of religious practice.

These examples of miracles worked for and by Moses by no means exhaust the stories which attached themselves to the leader. Given the belief that he was a wonder-worker and the absence of anything like historical records for the man or for the period in which he lived, it was inevitable that etiological cult and place sagas should attach themselves to the one character who was the most likely candidate for the central rôle of the story. Without doubt Moses, the supreme actor, replaced scores of lesser actors in the chief rôles of as many miracle plays.

The miracle stories clustered about Moses are the more remarkable when one considers their noticeable absence in the legendary material preserved about the patriarchs. Abraham moved about the land, lied, prospered, was magnanimous, built altars, even entertained angels, bought land, and did many other things, but he worked no miracles. Signs and wonders were beyond his ken.[35] The only possible exceptions are the gift of a son to Abraham at the age of one hundred and to his wife at ninety,[36] and the ram caught in the thicket.[37] True it is that Abraham talked with God and with angels, but these encounters were told without the signs and wonders which invariably accompanied the encounters of Moses with the deity.

In general, the same claim can be made for Isaac and Jacob. The Joseph tradition likewise may be said to have been immune to miraculous embroidery, if the power to interpret dreams is excluded from the definition of miracle. Legendary material was drawn upon by the Hebrew

[30] Lev. 10:1-7.
[31] Numb. 11:1-3.
[32] Numb. 16:1–17:5.
[33] Numb. 17:6-28.
[34] *Cf.* Heracles (Pausanias II, 31, 10).
[35] Gen. 15:17 is hardly a miracle, according to our definition.
[36] Gen. 17:16-17.
[37] Gen. 22:13.

tellers of these tales, but the miraculous element is almost entirely missing. This absence cannot be laid to any small part which the patriarchs played in the tradition out of which the epic was composed. They were important characters. Nor is it that they were not associated with religious tradition. They built altars, sacrificed, and figured prominently in the specifically religious institutions. They talked with the deity. But wonder-workers they could not properly be termed.

When the traditional picture of Moses is contrasted with that of David, the difference with regard to miracles is great. David is a hero, but he is no wonder-worker. He gets his work done by shrewd manœuvres, well-concocted schemes, and by a number of fortunate circumstances. But here, the battles are real and his successes, the reader must admit, are generally well deserved. The narrator never resorts to a miracle to bring his hero out of a difficulty. His enemies are slain by other men with swords, not engulfed in the crevice of an earthquake, or consumed by a strange fire. Why is there this difference in the character of the material preserved about these two men, David and Moses? An answer readily suggests itself. A body of historical writing, the court history of David in II Samuel 9–20, insured the preservation of the picture of David within the bounds of fact. Had this history not existed in written form, the sweet singer of Israel might have gathered to himself some of the more spectacular wonders which affixed themselves to the deliverer from Egyptian bondage. The existence of the artful, but remarkably objective, court history of David short-circuited the process which operated to produce the conventional picture of Moses.

Second only to Moses as a miracle-worker are the prophets Elijah and Elisha. These two prophets of the ninth century have gathered to themselves many stories of miracles attesting the divine presence. When compared with them, Samuel, a distant predecessor, is almost bereft of the divine power to effect the miraculous. On the nearer side of the ninth century the later prophets are indeed colorless when contrasted with the brilliant characters of Elijah and Elisha. Why have these two characters been made to wear the halos of miracle—actually it is but one nimbus which each wears in turn—while other prophets have had only the power to predict the future as a badge of their authority? Here the explanation for the difference in the traditions of Moses and David does not fit. Compare, for example, Elisha and Jeremiah. Concerning Elisha there exists a mass of historical fact in the stories told of his relation to kings and to definite political events. In this respect Elisha was a man involved in the politics of his day, just as was Jeremiah. For that involvement there is considerable evidence. Yet, did the factual core within the tradition about Elijah resist successfully the attraction of popular miracle

stories? It did not. In the Elisha cycle of stories there is a strange mixture of fact and fancy, history and legend. Why, then, did legend and miracle intrude so easily in the tradition of the ninth-century heroes? Perhaps all one can answer is that the preserved tradition of ninth-century prophecy was the peculiar property for considerable time of folk storytellers and enjoyed the contribution which this type of recital inevitably made. This proposed explanation requires, of course, the further assumption that the tradition of other prophets was entrusted to less imaginative hands, that is, priestly rather than popular schools.

A listing of the miracles in the Old Testament reveals the existence of certain channels or canons for the operation of the miraculous. The deity may have been thought to have been able to do anything and everything he wished—in theory at least. Actually, however, the realm of the deity's miraculous activity in the world was believed to be rather limited. Miracle stories were drawn from a sharply restricted repertoire. Surely this restriction operated unconsciously in the minds of the storytellers and their hearers. Nonetheless, it was an important negative factor in the growth of tradition. It was believed that miracles were worked for certain specified purposes: to attest the presence of the deity at a specific place or time, or to secure some practical result. To examine some of the purposes of miracles and to see the frequency of their appearance will serve to give an insight into the minds of the folk audience, which proved in the last analysis to be the supreme court for determining the formation of the tradition as we have it in the present text of the biblical records.

A frequent theme of miracle is the supplying of food and drink for the favored or the faithful. Reference has already been made to four instances in the tradition about Moses of providing water by miracle for the Israelites in the desert, and to the story of Samson's thirst quenched by water from the miraculous spring opened at Lehi. Moses was also credited with inducing Yahweh to provide food, consisting of manna and quails, for the Israelites. Hagar in her extremity found a well provided by God from which she filled a bottle with water and gave of it to her son to drink.[38] Three stories in the Elijah cycle have food as their theme. Ravens delivered morning and evening to Elijah at Cherith bread and flesh during a drought.[39] This they did until the brook dried up. As Elijah fled from Jezebel an angel twice, it seems, provided a cake and a cruse of water; the second provision was of such a nature that it sustained him for forty days and forty nights during his long trek to Horeb.[40] The miraculous flow of oil and the never failing jar of meal in the house of the widow of Zarephath[41] constitute a miracle of Elijah which falls into

[38] Gen. 21:19.
[39] I Kings 17:2-7.
[40] I Kings 19:5-8.
[41] I Kings 17:8-16.

this class. Four of the Elisha cycle of stories are upon this theme. Elisha purified water which was polluted by means of salt[42]—a miracle clearly parallel to Moses' magical deed at Marah. Clearly in imitation of the Zarephath incident is the miracle attributed to Elisha, in which a widow's financial distress was alleviated by a miraculous flow of oil, which was readily salable.[43] Elisha removed the poison from a great dish of pottage prepared for the hungry sons of the prophets simply by casting meal into it.[44] Again, the prophet is cast in the rôle of provider when he fed a hundred men from a mere twenty loaves of barley and a sack of fresh ears of corn.[45]

When one considers the relative infrequency with which miracle stories appear on the pages of the Old Testament, it is of significance that no less than fifteen stories deal with a miraculous provision for food and drink. The presence in the folk tradition of such a number of stories with this theme underlines the importance in the mind of the average peasant of the problem of obtaining food and drink. The problem of physical sustenance loomed large. Here it was that miracles were often needed and as often longed for. How better could regard for a character be expressed than by a story attributing to him the rôle of provider for these essentials? Successful leaders of the masses had to provide food; to have been able to do this by miracle was sure evidence for divine powers deserving veneration. Folklore brings into vivid relief the struggle for subsistence which must have gone on in that land described more poetically as a land flowing with milk and honey.

Another area in which the deity operated spectacularly was that of the punishment of evildoers. The plagues were, for the most part, punishments meeted out on the Egyptians. In some, the element of wonder was prominent. if not predominant; but in each of these cases the original miracle inevitably turned into a plague upon the Egyptians. The three incidents of spectacular punishment of those who murmured against or questioned the religious authority of Moses have been cited above. In addition to these there is the afflicting of leprosy upon Gehazi as punishment for his deceit.[46] Elijah called down fire to consume two bands, each of fifty men, which had come out to summon Elijah to appear before the sick king, Ahaziah.[47] Elisha called forth two she-bears to consume forty-two little children, whose only offense was the ditty, "Go up, thou baldhead; go up, thou baldhead." [48] Miriam was punished by leprosy, which lasted for seven days, for daring to speak against Moses' marriage to a Cushite woman.[49] If one counts but the seven plagues belonging to the earlier

[42] II Kings 2:19-22.
[43] II Kings 4:1-7.
[44] II Kings 4:38-41.
[45] II Kings 4:42-44.
[46] II Kings 5:20-27.
[47] II Kings 1:1-12.
[48] II Kings 2:23-24.
[49] Numb. 12:1-16.

tradition along with those miracles just mentioned, there are fourteen instances in which a miracle is worked to punish an offender or offenders against the deity or his chosen representative.

It should occasion no surprise that in the lore of the folk of Palestine the most spectacular of all diseases, leprosy, should be the frequent subject for miracle story. Miriam's punishment for criticizing the chosen leader was leprosy. Moses had become leprous. How could he ever forget this scare and the fact that Yahweh had called him? Elisha was able to heal, even a leper.[50] Further he could and did afflict a deceiving servant with the same dreadful disease. King Uzziah, according to the Chronicler,[51] broke out with leprosy on his forehead when he dared to trespass in the temple of Yahweh. About leprosy man could do little; this certainly was the realm for divine activity. What better way than healing or afflicting leprosy could there be for proving the power of Yahweh? Here, as elsewhere, miracles were not painted in delicate shades and narrow lines but with flaming colors and a broad brush. Miracle stories were never subtle or restrained: they were bold and frequently grotesque.

Yet another area for special activity on the part of the deity was that of granting children to old or barren women. Sarah (age ninety), Rebekah,[52] Hannah,[53] the wife of Manoah,[54] the woman of Shunem[55] were the recipients of the miraculous intervention of the deity granting to each a son. Here again the popular mind recognized the finality from a human standpoint of sterility or of old age. What better areas than these, where man was powerless, were there to serve as the occasions for the miraculous activity of God? Just as one can see in the food and water miracles the actuality of hunger and thirst within the experience of the people, so here there is apparent the strong longing for male children.

The miracle frequently proved decisive in a contest between two rivals. The *Wettkampf* motif followed a set pattern: each of two human contestants seeks to perform miracles for the purpose of displaying the powers of the god of which he is the representative. This particular motif was introduced at a later stage of development into the cycle of plague stories. Moses and Aaron were pitted against the Egyptian magicians. Each of the opposing groups was able to turn rods into serpents; but the superiority of the Hebrew magicians over their Egyptian opponents was demonstrated when Aaron's serpent swallowed the serpents of the Egyptians. At the end of each round of the contest the representatives of Yahweh emerged victorious, while their opponents were rendered either powerless or ridiculous. Of the same pattern is the miracle wrought by

[50] II Kings 5:27.
[51] II Chron. 26:19-20.
[52] Gen. 25:21.
[53] I Sam. 1:19-20.
[54] Judg. 13:2-3.
[55] II Kings 4:8-17.

Elijah at Carmel.[56] Here in dead earnest the gauntlet was thrown down. Yahweh responded by giving a decisive victory to his champion. His god was greatest who could work the best wonder.

More numerous are the cases in which the miracle serves as a sign to vindicate the claims for the god's very presence with a person or within a cultic object. The reader is certain that it is Yahweh's voice which called Moses when the call came to the accompaniment of the miracle of the burning bush and of the hand instantly turned leprous and as quickly healed. Ahaz knew for certain that Isaiah was a true prophet when the shadow went backward ten degrees.[57] Who could but believe in Joshua's god when the sun stood still for a day at Gibeon?[58] No practical purpose other than to convince a reluctant mortal was served by the miracle of the fleece of Gideon.[59] Yahweh's presence within the ark was certain when Dagon fell on his face before it in Ashdod and when the people of Ashdod were smitten with emerods,[60] and the 50,070 men of Beth-Shemesh were smitten "because they gazed" upon the box.[61] When one hears that a dead man revived upon contact with the bones of Elisha.[62] he may easily believe that Elisha had received a double portion of his master's spirit. All of these miracles may be classed as those which served no desired human needs. They are wonders—*Schauwunder*—pure and simple.

Yahweh not only sought to convince, it was thought, but he frequently gave some desirable good by miraculous means. It was as though a storyteller found himself caught in the web of his developing plot, from which nothing short of a miracle could extricate him. The miracle served a double purpose: it afforded irrefutable evidence for the powers of the deity and at the same time, by a happy stroke, it removed certain practical difficulties which the storyteller had created for himself. When some barrier presents itself in the route over which the narrator is taking his heroes, be it a sea,[63] a river,[64] an Assyrian army,[65] a walled city,[66] a miracle serves as a ready resource for its removal. This is not to say that these miracles were pure inventions out of whole cloth. They were not. Those who told them drew frequently upon older tradition and made use of circumstances which suggested themselves from the locale of the stories. Not infrequently the act of the wonder-worker exhibited a measure of kindness. Elisha is depicted as being touched by the distress of the son of the prophets who lost the costly borrowed property. He made the axhead swim and thus relieved the financial embarrassment of the theologian carpenter.[67]

[56] I Kings 18:20-40.
[57] II Kings 20:8-11.
[58] Josh. 10:12-14.
[59] Judg. 6:36-40.
[60] I Sam. 5:1-6; perhaps read "tumors" as *Kethib*.
[61] I Sam. 6:19.
[62] II Kings 13:20-21.
[63] Exod. 14:15-31.
[64] Josh. 3:9-17.
[65] II Kings 19:35-37.
[66] Josh. 6:12-21.
[67] II Kings 6:1-7.

Elisha, one cannot but feel, was concerned over the welfare of Naaman as well as for the reputation of his god, Yahweh. The same sympathy may easily be attributed to the prophet Elijah when he was confronted with the dead son of his widowed landlady in Zarephath,[68] and to Elisha in the duplicate resurrection story.[69] In both of these stories it is easy to see more kindness and gratitude than exhibitionism or zeal for the reputation of Yahweh. These miracles—and more could be mentioned—may have been used to show that the deity is not only powerful but merciful as well.

Finally a few generalizations may be drawn with regard to the physical instrument or means employed by the wonder-worker. Miracles performed directly by the deity were generally described merely as having been done, without the use of an instrument. The one exception is the earliest stratum of the first plague, where there is some evidence for Yahweh smiting the river with his rod.[70] The deity could do wonders at will, merely by bidding that they be done. Such was not the case, however, with his human representative. He needed some properties for playing the part of wonder-worker. Moses and Aaron had their respective rods, mentioned in the first, second, fifth, and sixth plagues as instruments for performing the miracle. Moses' rod figures in three of the spring miracles and at the battle of Rephidim. The magic rod used in this battle was probably the bronze serpent,[71] which, as a cultic object, remained in the temple until the iconoclastic reforms of Hezekiah.[72] The staff was used by an angel in working a miracle for Gideon.[73] In the resurrection story told about Elisha the prophet's staff proves to be ineffectual in raising the dead boy. In at least two instances a stick is the instrument.[74] Both Elijah and Elisha made use of the mantle to divide the waters of the Jordan.[75] Salt[76] and meal[77] served as purifying agents.

Symbolic acts, as well as physical objects, are frequently associated with the miracle-worker's activity. To produce the plague of boils Moses sprinkled soot from the kilns heavenward[78]; the staff stretched heavenward produced the hail, which was stopped by the mere gesture of extending the hands to Yahweh.[79] When Moses brought on the three days of darkness, he stretched out his hand toward heaven.[80] These gestures are certainly more than figures of speech; they contain some of the formula for the working of magic. The formula for the taking of Jericho[81] was a rather com-

[68] I Kings 17:17-24.
[69] II Kings 4:18-37.
[70] Exod. 7:17, 25.
[71] Numb. 21:5-9. See Gressmann, *Mose*, p. 48.
[72] II Kings 18:4.
[73] Judg. 6:21.
[74] Exod. 15:25; II Kings 6:6.
[75] II Kings 2:8-13.
[76] II Kings 2:19-22.
[77] II Kings 4:38-41.
[78] Exod. 9:8-12.
[79] Exod. 9:13-35.
[80] Exod. 10:21-29.
[81] Josh. 6.

plicated sympathetic drama. Elisha healed the leper[82] by means of ritual baths. The method employed for raising the dead boy was to give his body some of the heat from the prophet's own body.[83] Here a word was not enough, neither was the staff; work of a strenuous character was a necessary prerequisite.

In a few cases prayer—something more than the recitation of words, certainly—was the instrument for performing the miracle.[84] These diverse means—physical objects, mimicry, magic, ritual—gave considerable color to the stories. Beneath them lies the belief that the miracle-worker needed certain helps and was not as free as Yahweh himself to do the miraculous. This factor constitutes the great gulf between the deity and his human representative. Here too, as in the area of miraculous activity, there was a fixed canon. Certain objects belonged naturally to the properties of the miracle-worker.

Concerned as this paper has been with miracles in the books of the Hebrew Bible, this type of story may, for the moment, loom large. Should one, then, conclude that miracle was a dominant form in Hebrew tradition? By no means. When the entire literature is viewed as a whole, miracle is but a minor strain, a very small fraction of the total mass. Stories of this nature cluster chiefly about a few characters and are noticeably absent from the narratives about scores of other important people of the Bible. The patriarchs, the written prophets, the kings, the wise men appear and disappear with few, if any, miraculous stories about them. When miracles do appear, little is added to our knowledge of the person about whom the story is told, but much is implied about the character and beliefs of the folk audience for whom the miraculous stories were devised. From the many wonder stories which cluster about Moses we gain little knowledge about the great leader; but we are instructed in detail about the mind and life of more than a score of generations of his admirers. The miracle story is a mirror in which is reflected the life of those who tell or hear it.

[82] II Kings 5.
[83] II Kings 4:18-37.
[84] Numb. 11:1-3.

TRUTH IN DEED

EDWIN EWART AUBREY

University of Pennsylvania

"INDEED?" we ask when someone tells us something hard to believe. Here two words are fused into one. The test of truth is found in deed. There is in the Fourth Gospel a verse that warrants careful considering: "But he that doeth truth cometh to the light, that his deeds may be made manifest, that they are wrought in God." [1]

The man who wrote these words was combating the most persistent heresy in Christianity. This heresy was not merely a variant interpretation of some particular doctrine, though it produced some drastic aberrations which were called Gnosticism. The fundamental error he was attacking was the notion that verbal confession can be a substitute for consecration.

I

The verse just cited speaks first of "doing the truth." We are called to action rather than verbalization. The Bible says that we should be doers of the word and not hearers only. It is equally important that we should not be only speakers of the word. Here lies the perennial peril of professional speakers: we like to talk about truth, we do not so often act it out. Jesus told a story about two sons who were ordered out in the field to work for their father. One said he would go, and didn't. The other said he would not go, but did. It is clear that Jesus favored the one who spoke rebelliously but acted obediently. It was the deed that counted rather than the word.

Jesus repeatedly showed distrust of those who made pious professions which they contradicted with their lives. If there was anything that the Master could not abide, it was insincerity. On the other hand, he showed a shocking admiration and affection for rather disreputable people whose good deeds expressed the essence of his gospel: the Samaritan with his wrongheaded ecclesiastical notions about the temple, who cared for a man in need; Zacchæus the hated taxgatherer who returned with interest his illgotten gain; the pagan army captain who showed complete trust in Jesus' ability to heal his child; the poor widow who gave sacrificially of her meagre funds.

This central point in Christ's ministry the Fourth Evangelist clearly saw. The word of God was not merely spoken, it was incarnate in a life. The ultimate truth, the Logos, was not merely proclaimed; it was seen

[1] John 3:21.

in action. Henceforth there could be no claim to enlightenment that was not backed up by love. "He that saith, I know God, and hateth his brother," that man is really a liar. Truth is not information, it is incarnation.

This too is the secret of our vocation, of anyone's vocation. For what is one's vocation but to do the truth in one's own situation? How easy it is to say this? How desperately hard it is to live it out: to give honest work, to give to a job however small one's best and nothing less, to make a screw tight, to choose a word carefully, to handle a person with scrupulous regard for his well-being! The agony of doing the truth is that we do not fully know what it is, and yet we have to do it or incur disaster for ourselves and others. This is why faith is a form of suffering. This is why faith is continually seeking more light.

II

And so "he that doeth truth cometh to the light." But do we dare? Are we not all like criminal suspects standing in the line-up with glaring lights shining on us, and afraid of being found out? And so we try to evade the light even in the ministry. We hide behind people's "respect for the cloth." We use pomposity as a mask, hoping the laity will not dare to challenge our sonorous declarations. The more technical we can be in discussing theology the better chance we have of bluffing through against the plain, penetrating questions.

> All the loveliest things that be
> Come simply, so it seems to me.

The woman who said that was Edna St. Vincent Millay whose *Conversation at Midnight* is still one of the finest examples of honest theological discussion. She brought our favored dogmas to the light for scrutiny.

There is perhaps nothing more dangerous for the minister than the unrebuked sermon. One of the sturdiest minds I have known in the pulpit always had his sermons subjected to discussion after the service at a church dinner—and with another man as moderator! How many of us would dare that? Because we are tolerably sure that no one will be rude enough to interrupt the sermon to cry "Nonsense!" or "That is not true!" or "You have slipped around the issue there, pastor," we often presume on politeness with shoddy preaching. Are we ready so to preach that we could have our preaching brought to the light without shame?

Words conceal as well as reveal meanings. How are we using our words? Do we resort to the language of Zion to cover the paucity of our own thinking, using a bassoon to drown out the untuned string on the violin in our symphony of thought? "Yes," said Kierkegaard, "man can deceive himself and men. But when eternity listens attentively . . . alas,

it instantly detects false tones and hesitation. . . . Alas, it is a sorry cleverness . . . that deceives itself about what is the highest of all. The only genuine cleverness is that which helps a man in all devotedness truly to will the Good."[2] It is "a sorry cleverness" too that leads a man to use involved extraneous argument in the pulpit or the classroom to cover up a lack of cogent reasoning on the main issue at hand.

The tragedy is that such habits get a firm hold on us till eventually we find it harder and harder to seek the light in its simplicity. "If thine eye be dark, then is thy whole body full of darkness." Let us avoid then the fantasy of words that cloud the issue, lest after a while we be not even able to identify the main issue ourselves.

"He that doeth truth cometh to the light." He opens his life as a book to be read. I do not mean that we are to expose our intimate personal concerns for all to see. (Jesus went away by himself on occasion, and his disciples knew little of what happened then.) But deliberately to conceal our real thoughts behind pious words and actions *in order to appear other than we are:* that is a ghastly hypocrisy. Let men know by one's fruits whether he is a good tree. Then they will dare to lean on us, and to seek relief from the heat of life in our shade.

Mark Twain's cynicism was never more mordant than in his story about "The Man Who Corrupted Hadleyburg." In that tale a man who always spoke the truth frankly was the source of innumerable social disasters in the little town. But who shall say whether the author was satirizing the frankness of the man or the humbug of small-town life? There is such a thing as "speaking the truth in love," but one must still speak the truth—and better still, act it. Let me suggest a simple recipe for honest living: Say what you mean. Do what you say. Mean what you do. This is the best prescription I know to escape hypocrisy. It may put you on a restricted regimen in talking. (We are apt to say more than we mean when we talk too glibly and too much.) It may require more exercise if we are to do what we say, and perhaps then we shall not say so much! It will demand periodic examinations to determine if we mean what we do; we shall then do better what we really mean to do. So say what you mean, do what you say, and mean what you do.

But there is also a profound religious note in this part of the ancient word. Let us not forget that in the Fourth Gospel Jesus Christ is the light. So the man who comes to the light in Jesus Christ comes both under his judgment and into his saving power. To place our ministry under his searching gaze, as that gaze was turned on the self-satisfied and the self-confessed sinners alike, is to turn away from the plaudits of the crowd to a higher bar of judgment. To seek his light is to make contact with

[2] S. Kierkegaard, *Purity of Heart,* p. 121 (Steere's translation).

a ministry that had tapped the sources of divine power. Even Nietzsche never accused Jesus of dishonesty; and if we keep contact with the gracious but exacting preacher from Nazareth, we may hope to find a glowing purity of motive that cleanses as it strengthens us.

III

"He that doeth truth cometh to the light *that his deeds may be made manifest.*" He welcomes the judgment. He is ready to let his ministry stand on its merits. The record shall speak for itself.

> Praise from a friend, or censure from a foe
> Are lost on hearers that our merits know.

Alexander Pope wrote those words; and another man who suffered greatly at the hands of men who attacked him bitterly and undeservedly, Abraham Lincoln, echoed them in a higher key when he said, "Truth is generally the best vindication against slander." "Actions," we say, "speak louder than words"; and the test of a man's professions is his practice. That is why the daily press carried across the country recently—much to the minister's embarrassment—the story of a clergyman who submitted himself to a grafting operation to help a disabled boy. Here they said was a minister who practiced what he preached. The implication of the newspapers' comments was not too pleasant on its negative side; and we are challenged as ministers to ask whether we would care to submit our behavior to examination for the record.

There are two besetting temptations which the minister must resist. One is gossip. Because of his special position the pastor hears much confidential information about parishioners who are also his neighbors. He is also subject to closer surveillance and to gossipy rumors on inconsequential items of conduct: he was seen in the line seeking admission to a movie where Bingo was played nightly, or his son was seen talking to another boy at the entrance to a pool parlor, or he was found talking to a parishioner's wife with her hand in both of his. *One* untoward act on the minister's part is enough to lend serious import to all these inconsequential circumstances in the mind of the public. Being so easily the victim of gossip, the minister should be especially careful not to indulge in gossip himself. Beware, therefore, the whisper spoken out of the corner of the mouth, or behind the hand. Some woman hater has said that women use fans because their hands are not big enough to cover all the gossip they repeat. Some ministers would need a whole screen. A good test to apply to one's remarks about other people is: how would they sound if read in open court as testimony and subjected to cross-examination? The Christian must ask not only "Are they true?" but "Are they helpful?"

And the latter question requires considerable power of discrimination in the answering. If you are not sure, keep silent.

The other temptation for the minister arises out of ecclesiastical politics. No denomination is altogether free from this. The danger lies in a sort of secret diplomacy sometimes characterized by what we may call ecclesiastical gossip and by manœuvring for advantage. When the matter comes to light, it is carefully camouflaged by pious utterance and noble purpose, and may succeed in its aim unless some self-styled diplomatist falters or some utterly frank person exposes the whole business. Then the group which was being outmanœuvred is filled with resentment and the cold war continues. As one grows in influence in the denomination, this peril increases, but there are plenty of little fellows who early fall victim to the insidious attractions of this road to power. Therefore, we should so act from the beginning of our ministry that our deeds may be made manifest without shame.

We shall probably sooner or later be the object of attack. I have never forgotten a talk with Shailer Mathews, late dean of the Divinity School of the University of Chicago, who was bitterly attacked as a modernist by fundamentalist leaders back in the twenties. I asked him years later how he managed to keep his temper in the face of these attacks. He said, "I made up my mind not to say or do anything for which I should later need to apologize."

The man who can do that can relax. He has nothing to fear from his own conscience. His memories are bearable. Allow me to quote Kierkegaard again on the opposite condition, the memory of the man whose deeds dare not be made manifest:

> But the remembering, the remembering! Let us indeed never forget the remembering, although a person might certainly believe that he would at least be able to forget. And shall not memory be able to remind him of that time when he sneaked away by underhanded means, in order to avoid a decision; of that time when he gave the matter another turn, in order to please men; of that time that he deserted his post, in order to let the storm pass over; of that time he knuckled under, in order to secure an easing off of his painful position; of that time he sought refuge and association with others—perhaps, as it is called, in order to work all the more effectively for the Good's victory, that is, in order to make his own position a little less difficult than as though at the midnight hour, somewhat terror-stricken, one stood all alone "with heavily loaded weapons at his dangerous post."[3]

There is for such a man—and who of us is not such a man at times?—no relaxing in the calm of personal integrity.

The true reward of integrity is freedom from the gnawing fear of being found out. If we can come to the light and have our acts made public, confident that we shall be shown to be what we claimed to be, then it is that integrity pays its dividends.

[3] *Op. cit.*, p. 127.

IV

Then we are vindicated as really being what we seem. But we may be honestly bad. There are men who make no bones about being ruthless or licentious or cynical or self-seeking. The verse which we have been examining suggests a vindication at a higher level of character: "He that doeth the truth cometh to the light that his deeds may be made manifest, *that they are wrought in God.*" What a serious thing it is to call a minister "a man of God"! He is to be a purveyor of the gospel to men: an agent of God. He is also charged to be one through whom the meaning of God for other men can shine. In a sense, a terrible sense, he is to be another incarnation of God's power in Christ. Do not the Germans call a Christian *ein Christ?*

How can we know that our deeds are "wrought in God"? There are two tests that we can apply. One is a general philosophical test, the other is specifically Christian. Whatever else God is for the philosopher, he is the inexorably real. That man whose deeds are wrought in God is the one who lives in reality, who accepts facts, whose life is one of honest search for what is real and true. He lives by the faith that in the long run "truth alone is strong." This is the hard core of his integrity.

The other, more specifically Christian, test is the revelation of God in Jesus Christ as love incarnate. If the minister can learn to stand in the shoes of a needy person, to see the hidden possibilities of that person, and then give his own life in service to help a man realize those finest possibilities: that is love. It is a quality of life that can be manifested in any situation great or small; and it lives by faith. The cynic sees the evil in every good situation; the man of faith sees the good in every bad situation.

No finer synthesis of these two expressions of God is found anywhere than in Eph. 4:15: "speaking truth in love." Find a man or woman who can speak *truth* in love, and also speak truth in *love,* and you have one whose deeds are made manifest that they are wrought in God.

But there is another meaning of this phrase, "wrought in God." It is related to the deep conviction that brings Paul and the Johannine writer together despite their other differences. It is the sense of dwelling within the purpose of God, "living in the Spirit," and thus being borne up by forces beyond ourselves as God's power "flows around our incompleteness" toward his divine consummation. We do not know what that consummation will be like, but we may have confidence that if we stick close to reality, deciding for the true against the false and for the permanent against the passing vogue; and if we act in love: we shall find ourselves undergirded. Then we can afford to wait for our vindication. We shall not need to rush to the hustings to affirm our integrity or our worth. Our lives will vindicate themselves.

SHAKESPEARE'S CARDINALS AND BISHOPS

ROBERT STEVENSON

University of California

I

SHAKESPEARE'S portrait gallery of high-ranking church dignitaries is a surprisingly limited one. A total of fifteen prelates may seem large enough, but five of these fifteen appear in *Henry VIII,* whose authorship Shakespeare shared with another playwright. In the plays which were gathered together by Heminge and Condell for the First Folio (1623) the plays dealing with British kings reigning after the Norman Conquest were called "Histories," and it is in these history plays alone, and not in any of the tragedies or comedies, that we find Shakespeare including cardinals, archbishops, and bishops, in the casts of characters. If we eliminate *Henry VIII* from the count, we are left with only nine histories, and in this group of nine plays we find drawn the characters of three cardinals, three archbishops, three bishops, and one abbot.

In these same nine plays there appear well over one hundred individual secular noblemen with speaking parts. The subject of all these plays is the political history of England. Does Shakespeare intend his audience to infer that lords temporal had ten times as much to do in shaping the course of English political history during the Middle Ages as did lords spiritual?

Nearly all of his source material for these histories was drawn from the *Chronicles* (1586) of Raphael Holinshed and (1548) of Edward Hall. And these two chroniclers were indubitably anticatholic to the core. Yet both of them while venting their spleen upon "lewd legates of the pope with their saucy speeches" and while picturing the clerical crowd in the Middle Ages in most unflattering terms, yet do present them as a *crowd.* Their pages bustle with important embassages entrusted to bishops and archbishops, vital decisions of state rendered by prelates, wars initiated and peaces consummated at the direction of churchmen. The churchmen, who as a matter of accepted fact did share a large part in running state affairs during the Middle Ages, are also represented in Holinshed and in Hall as vital cogs in the machinery of politics. While criticizing in virulent fashion, neither Holinshed nor Hall provided Shakespeare with any warrant for picturing his prelates as "Jacks out of office," excluded from the running of state affairs.

Shakespeare drastically altered the ratio of clerical to lay figures; whereas in Holinshed one out of three or four lords appearing in the narrative may be a lord spiritual, in Shakespeare the lord spiritual is more nearly matched against the lord temporal in a ratio of one to twelve. A sec-

ond significant aspect of Shakespeare's treatment of his lords spiritual is his irritating habit of stealing good speeches and generous gestures allotted in Holinshed to churchmen, and using the same good speech or the same generous gesture in order to endow one of his playboy nobles with more effective lines and padding. There are numerous examples of this Tudor tendency to rob the church and endow the nobles in Shakespeare's plays, and he did not learn the trick from Holinshed. Rather he deprived the churchmen of the few ornaments of virtue, intelligence, and uprightness which even Holinshed was willing to let them retain. There are numerous instances of this kind of thing, and we shall set up the bill for his "robberies" in detail a little later in the course of our discussion. Before we proceed to the analysis of examples, we simply complete our general introduction to Shakespeare's gallery of ecclesiastical bigwigs by mentioning a third general line of approach Shakespeare uses in treating his prelates. We have said, first, that he gets rid of them when he can; the playgoer then thinks the prelates played no part in the central drama of political events (and Holinshed gives a diametrically opposed account). We have said, in the second place, that when he needs the action performed by a churchman in Holished for the progress of his plot, he credits the action not to Holinshed's kicked-about churchman, but to one of his own lay lords. And we say, in the third place, that he grossly defames the one or two churchmen whom he does consent to portray at somewhat greater length (particularly Cardinal Beaufort).

II

No one reading *Richard II* would suspect that Shakespeare had omitted from the cast of characters the very individual whom Holinshed pictured as the chief instigator of the plot to bring Bolingbroke back from the Continent and to enthrone him in place of Richard. Henry Percy, Lord Northumberland, remains on stage after the departure of Richard for the Irish expedition, discussing the prospects for a successful rebellion with two other lords. He has, he tells them, received intelligence that Henry Bolingbroke, victim of Richard's blind caprice, is readying himself with certain followers, Lord Cobham, the late archbishop of Canterbury, Sir Thomas Erpingham, Sir John Ramston, Sir John Norbery, Sir Robert Waterton, and Francis Quoint, for a descent upon the coast of England.[1] This long list of names serves no other dramatic purpose than the promise of success with so large a following. None of the gentlemen mentioned in the list actually appears on the scene later during the play. And yet this list contains the name of one individual who played the principal rôle

[1] *Richard II*, II, i, 279-284. See also the parallel account in Holinshed's *Chronicles*, Vol. II, London, 1807, p. 852.

in inducing Richard to lay aside his crown quietly after Bolingbroke returned, and who also played the principal rôle (as Holinshed describes the scene) in inducing the commons to accept Bolingbroke as king. In the original source we find Holinshed's account: "Chiefly through the earnest persuasion of Thomas Arundel, late Archbishop of Canterbury, who . . . had been removed from his see, and banished the realm by King Richard's means,"[2] Bolingbroke decided to gather forces for a return to England. When Bolingbroke encounters his old uncle whom Richard has appointed lord governor of the realm during an absence in Ireland, according to Shakespeare, only the smooth line of Bolingbroke averts an open clash, and wins the crucial support of York.[3] According to Holinshed, the meeting between York and Bolingbroke occurred not in the "Wilds of Gloucestershire" but inside a church; with Bolingbroke were "Thomas Arundel, Archbishop of Canterbury, and Abbot of Leicester,"[4] and several lay lords.

In Shakespeare Bolingbroke meets Richard in Wales, before Flint Castle. Richard robes himself in all the gorgeous panoply of verbiage which is his distinctive glory throughout the play. As the scene progresses, Northumberland goes aloft on the castle walls in order to induce Richard to come down and treat with Henry. Northumberland assures Richard

> Henry Bolingbroke doth humbly kiss thy hand;
> And by the honourable tomb he swears,
> That stands upon your royal grandsire's bones,

and by several other suitably sacrosanct things,

> Comprising all that may be sworn or said,
> His coming hither hath no other scope

than the regaining of his ancestral lands and titles, after which he means to commend his heart "To faithful service of your Majesty." Northumberland adds, "as I am a gentleman, I credit him."[5] Richard apparently accepts all this fustian at face value, although after Northumberland goes back to report on the conference to Bolingbroke, Richard toys with the idea of calling Northumberland back. In Holinshed we find another account. Not only Northumberland, but also Archbishop Arundel undertakes the delicate task of winning Richard to a show of compliance. In the source, Richard "drawing the Archbishop aside from the residue, talked with him a good while, and as it was reported, the Archbishop willed him to be of good comfort, for he should be assured not to have any hurt, as touching his person."[6] Upon their return to London for the deposition parliament, Holinshed tells us Bolingbroke stayed at the archbishop's

[2] Holinshed's *Chronicles*, Vol. II, p. 852.
[3] *Richard II*, II, iii, 81-171.
[4] Holinshed's *Chronicles*, Vol. II, p. 853.
[5] *Richard II*, III, iii, 101-120.
[6] Holinshed's *Chronicles*, Vol. II, p. 857.

palace. Seven of "the articles objected to King Richard, whereby he was caused worthy to be deposed from his principality," as the chronicler lists them, appertained to Archbishop Arundel's grievances.

Shakespeare places the deposition scene in Westminster Hall. Holinshed states that Richard constantly leaned on his cousin, Archbishop Arundel, during the deposition scene, conversing with him at length. He handed the scroll of abdication to the archbishop, the chronicler adds, Richard "saying that if it were in his power, or at his assignment he would that the Duke of Lancaster should be his successor."[7] The archbishop of York (the same Scroop with whom Henry IV had his troubles later) together with the bishop of Hereford carried the abdication instrument into Parliament. The sentencing of Richard to deposition was allotted to the bishop of Saint Asaph along with certain others. Having gained the assent of the lords to the enthronement of Henry Bolingbroke, Archbishop Arundel then delivered an oration to the commons inducing them to consent also. Then Arundel, archbishop of Canterbury, and Scroop, archbishop of York, after prayer, reverently placed Henry on the regal throne. Holinshed's account consistently makes Archbishop Arundel the instigator, promoter, and leader of the movement to place Henry on the throne. Hall's account, while shorter than Holinshed's, confirms the same impression concerning the paramount importance of Archbishop Arundel in the whole affair. Shakespeare condescends to give Arundel one line of mention in the play.

No doubt Shakespeare showed wisdom in excising Archbishop Arundel. When Essex's friend, Sir Gelly Meyrick, arranged with Shakespeare's company for the performance of a play "of the deposing and killing of Richard II," two days before the date set for the Essex rebellion,[8] Elizabeth had somehow or another come to be regarded as another Richard II, possibly because she too was surrounded with evil advisers and flattering favorites. Once Elizabeth had said in conversation, "I am Richard II, know ye not that?"[9] If she became identified with Richard II, a play in which the archbishops of Canterbury and York were ranged against her would have been political dynamite. John Whitgift, her own archbishop of Canterbury, had already, through the intermediacy of his licensers, shown a disposition to cut out of any play a reference which would suggest a parallel with contemporary figures. We shall see later that Whitgift was responsible for mutilating certain passages in *2 Henry IV* which touched on Archbishop Scroop's part in the rebellion of 1405. In the play, *Edward II,* Christopher Marlowe had also treated the subject of a king's deposition,

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 863.
[8] Hardin Craig, *Shakespeare,* New York, 1931, p. 314.
[9] Quoted from *Progresses of Elizabeth,* in Craig, *op. cit.*, p. 314.

and his play appeared only a few years before Shakespeare's. In Marlowe's *Edward II* we find another archbishop of Canterbury, this time threatening the king with loss of the kingdom for his crimes against the state.[10] However, when the chips are down the archbishop and his subaltern in *Edward II,* the bishop of Coventry, are not actually the ringleaders in a successful deposition. Had Shakespeare actually transcribed Holinshed, however, in any faithful manner, an archbishop of Canterbury would have appeared whose complicity in the deposition of a lawful king would have carried dangerous political implications. The Erastian Elizabethan church was not prepared to stomach any such independent high-handedness as the deposition of a king. When a deposition did actually occur almost a century later, a large section of the church, while hating the deposed king, preferred everlasting loyalty to him, rather than allegiance to an "unlawful" sovereign.[11]

The one prelate whom Shakespeare included in the cast of characters for *Richard II* was the so-called good bishop of Carlisle. In Holinshed he, alone of all the ecclesiastics mentioned, remained faithful to Richard. But with such a galaxy of brilliant ecclesiastics opposing him, his loyalty makes little impression. But in Shakespeare with all the Bolingbrokian prelates swept off the boards, Carlisle comes off with first honors. His magnificent rhetoric in extolling the honors of

> the figure of God's majesty,
> His captain, steward, deputy elect,
> Anointed, crowned, planted many years,[12]

and his Cassandralike warnings against Bolingbroke,

> if you crown him, let me prophesy:
> That blood of English shall manure the ground,
> And future ages groan for this foul act. . . .
> Disorder, horror, fear, and mutiny
> Shall here inhabit, and this land be call'd
> The field of Golgotha and dead men's skulls,[13]

are among Shakespeare's finest poetry in the play. Scholars have often pointed out that Carlisle is the only worthy prelate Shakespeare introduces into his plays. Is it perhaps significant that Shakespeare bestowed such incandescent poetry on a doughty champion of the balm that all the water in the rough, rude sea cannot wash off an anointed king? Is it significant that he was a bishop of Carlisle? And is it relevant that Elizabeth was crowned by a bishop of Carlisle? Certainly if she saw this play, and if

[10] Marlowe, *Edward II,* I, iv, 3, 43-44, 51-53, 59-62, 74.
[11] On the subject of the nonjuring schism see A. S. Turberville, *Oxford Historical and Literary Studies,* Vol. III, Oxford, 1913, pp. 16-17.
[12] *Richard II,* IV, i, 125-127.
[13] *Ibid.,* IV, i, 136-144.

she likened herself to Richard II, she must have derived considerable satisfaction from the sturdy loyalty the bishop of Carlisle showed in the play. She could hardly help recalling that when the bishops of greater precedency, Heath and Tunstall, refused to crown her, Dr. Owen Oglethorpe, bishop of Carlisle, placed the crown on her head. Although her later relations with Oglethorpe were somewhat strained, at his death it is said the queen was favorably inclined to him.[14]

III

We have seen how Shakespeare frequently altered his chronicle source material in order more nearly to conform to the Erastian sentiments of his own day. It is of course possible that the greatly reduced number of speaking parts for high-ranking clergymen resulted in part from a desire to keep the casts of characters within manageable limits. Certainly when he simply leaves out a prelate, ascribing one prelate's acts to another in the play, as he does in *King John* where Cardinal Gualo is assimilated into the part of Cardinal Pandulph, desirable economy may have been achieved. (In Holinshed Gualo undertook to dissuade Philip of France from continuing hostilities against England after King John made his submission to the pope.) But in general, Shakespeare seems simply to have preferred ascribing to lay lords those generous gestures and magnanimous speeches which Holinshed had ascribed to churchmen. As we have intimated, Holinshed had no private romance on with princes of the church himself; but he did not ruthlessly expurgate every noble sentiment and every beneficent purpose from the rôles of churchmen in his chronicles, as does Shakespeare in his plays. "There is no good among them [the churchmen] from Pandulph to Cranmer, except the Bishop of Carlisle. . . . All the prelates are Machiavellians, all the inferior clergy are conjurers and imposters."[15]

The consideration of some pertinent examples may clarify Shakespeare's procedure. According to Holinshed, a fair offer of peace was made at Shrewsbury to the rebels assembled by the Percies. The peace offer was transmitted through the abbot of Shrewsbury. He was sent "from the King unto the Percies, to offer them pardon, if they would come to any reasonable agreement." Taking with him a clerk of the privy seal, the Shrewsbury abbot was successful in inducing Henry Percy "to give care unto the King's offers," and Percy then "sent to declare unto the King the causes of those troubles [which had caused the rebellion] and to require some effectual reformation of the same."[16] The Shrewsbury

[14] *Dictionary of National Biography*, Vol. XLII, New York, 1895, pp. 48-49.
[15] H. H. Furness, ed., *New Variorum Shakespeare: King John*, Philadelphia, 1919, pp. 195-196.
[16] Holinshed's *Chronicles*, Vol. III, London, 1808, p. 25.

abbot not only enjoys the prestige of acting the blessed rôle of peacemaker: according to the chronicler he even carried out his assignment in a manner calculated to win the enemy into an acceptance of peace overtures. In Shakespeare, on the other hand, the peace emissary is no abbot; he becomes instead a lord temporal, Sir Walter Blunt, "good Blunt," as King Henry IV calls him on another occasion. Elsewhere in the play Blunt has nothing more important to do than report a few events to higher headquarters, and the total number of lines he speaks elsewhere in the play adds up only to twenty-one. As messenger of peace in the fourth act[17] of *1 Henry IV*, he speaks his fattest lines.

Another excellent example of Shakespeare's procedure occurs in his shrill hymn of praise to the mirror of Christian kings, *Henry V*. Shakespeare for this play drew not only upon Holinshed, but also had at hand an earlier play on the same subject, *The Famous Victories of Henry V*. This earlier play attempts to compress into one play material that Shakespeare expands into three. In *The Famous Victories* the ambassador who comes from France is the archbishop of Bourges. His offer of peace includes the following lines:

> Charles the Seventh, the great and mighty King of France,
> As a most noble and Christian king,
> Not minding to shed innocent blood, is rather content
> To yield somewhat to your unreasonable demands,
> That if fifty thousand crowns a year with his daughter
> The said Lady Katharine, in marriage,
> And some crowns which he may well spare,
> Not hurting of his kingdom,
> He is content to yield so far to your unreasonable desire.[18]

Henry replies to "my Lord Archbishop of Bourges,"

> That all the crowns in France shall not serve me,
> Except the crown and kingdom itself:
> And perhaps hereafter I will have his daughter.

The archbishop delivers the tennis balls. Henry asks,

> I pray you good my Lord Archbishop,
> What might the meaning thereof be?

The archbishop hesitates to give his opinion and then confides that the Prince Dauphin

> hearing of your wildness before your
> Father's death, sent you this my good Lord,
> Meaning that you are more fitter for a Tennis Court
> Than a field, and more fitter for a Carpet than the camp.[19]

[17] *1 Henry IV*, IV, iii, 30-31, 38-51, 89, 106, 112.
[18] *Six Old Plays*, Vol. II, London, 1779, pp. 349-350.
[19] *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 350.

Shakespeare introduces in *Henry V* two ambassadors in place of the one ambassador, the archbishop of Bourges, and makes his ambassadors an insulting pair from the first words they utter. They begin with a question,

> shall we sparingly show you far off
> The Dauphin's meaning and our embassy?

No mention is made of an offer of peace from Charles of France, or the offer of his daughter, Katharine. Rather they insult him by asking him for permission to retail in mordant detail the contempt of their master, the Dauphin:

> the prince our master ·
> Says that you savour too much of your youth,
> And bids you be advis'd there's nought in France
> That can be with a nimble galliard won;
> You cannot revel into dukedoms there.[20]

The ambassador's speeches knife Henry with the keen edge of sarcasm; they spit in Henry's eye, as it were, and bait him with the grossest taunts. Gone in Shakespeare is the reverend ambassador, the archbishop of Bourges, and in his place we enjoy the rapier thrusts of two saucy French nobles who know more about nimble measures of the dance than they do of the horrors of shedding innocent blood.

Obviously Shakespeare did not alter Holinshed and *The Famous Victories* in order to economize on speaking parts; two reasons suggest themselves: he wanted a garbled message from the enemy in order to set the British lion roaring, and he wanted to save the overtones of churchly sanction exclusively for Henry's "sacred throne," which a few moments before the entrance of the ambassadors the archbishop of Canterbury and the bishop of Ely have prayed God and his angels to guard. After Canterbury has "justly and religiously unfolded why the law Salic that they have in France should not bar us in our claim," and after Canterbury has cited the Book of Numbers and called down "the sin upon my head," if Henry be not just in pursuing his claim, it would indeed be somewhat of an anticlimactic blow for another equally reverend archbishop to march on the stage calling Henry's demands unreasonable, but nevertheless extending the olive branch of peace, and offering the French king's daughter in marriage to Henry. All poor Williams' questioning, "if the [king's] cause be not good, the king himself hath a heavy reckoning to make, when all those legs and arms and heads, chopp'd off in a battle, shall join together at the latter day,"[21] would indeed be a far more serious indictment against Henry, were the audience left in the slightest doubt concerning the justice of his cause. Shakespeare has, however, taken good

[20] *Henry V*, I, ii, 245-257.
[21] *Ibid.*, IV, i, 139-153.

care to stack the cards just the way he wants them to read. Psychological warfare experts in our day could teach Shakespeare nothing.

IV

We have seen how Blunt carries an offer of peace to the forces of Hotspur at Shrewsbury in Shakespeare, whereas a reverend abbot carried the peace offer in Holinshed. We have also seen how a stately archbishop carried an offer of peace to Henry V from Charles VII of France in Shakespeare's source, while in his own play two impudent French nobles carry no offer of peace but a present of taunts. This pattern is further exemplified in the first play dealing with the career of Henry V's successor. At the beginning of the fifth act in *2 Henry VI* Shakespeare makes Humphrey, duke of Gloucester, the advocate of peace, whereas in the source the advocate who so effectively argued for peace was a cardinal. In Holinshed, the cardinal of S. Crosse in his suit for peace called to mind "the innumerable mischiefs, that had followed to the whole state of the Christian commonwealth by their continual dissension and daily discord, exhorting them for the honor of God, and for the love which they ought to bear towards the advancement of his faith and true religion, to conform themselves to reason, and to lay aside all rancor, malice, and displeasure; so that in concluding a *godly peace,* they might receive profit and *quietness* here in this world, and of God an everlasting reward in heaven."[22] In Shakespeare, Gloucester uses the very phrase, "godly peace," putting it in Gloucester's mouth. Humphey of Gloucester, "good Duke Humphrey," as Shakespeare would make him out to be, says that letters have come humbly suing

> unto your excellence
> To have a godly peace concluded of
> Between the realms of England and of France.

King Henry flatteringly asks Gloucester,

> How doth your Grace affect their motion?

Gloucester thinks well of the idea of peace, and says peace is

> the only means
> To stop effusion of our Christian blood
> And stablish quietness on every side.

It was because he foresaw this unnatural effusion of Christian blood that the archbishop of Bourges had tried to prevent a war at the beginning of Henry V's reign. Henry VI, a pious soul "whose churchlike humours fits not for a crown," takes up Gloucester's thread of thought,

[22] Holinshed's *Chronicles,* Vol. III, p. 182.

for I always thought
It was both impious and unnatural
That such immanity and bloody strife
Should reign among professors of one faith.[23]

Following the same general trend excluding prelates and transferring their better speeches and deeds into the mouths of his nobles, we find the duke of Buckingham accompanied by the old Lord Clifford replacing the archbishop of Canterbury and the bishop of Winchester in an episode occurring during Jack Cade's rebellion. During this rebellion Holinshed tells us that King Henry VI, prevailed upon by the archbishop of Canterbury, his chancellor, sent down a general pardon to the followers of Cade in the hope of weaning away the more sensible sort from the revolt. Together with the bishop of Winchester, the archbishop "seeing the fury of the Kentish people, by their late repulse, to be somewhat assuaged, passed by the river of Thames from the Tower into Southwark, bringing . . . a general pardon unto all the offenders, and caused the same to be openly published. The poor people were so glad of this pardon, and so ready to receive it, that without bidding farewell to their captain, they withdrew themselves that same night every man towards his home."[24] Shakespeare, however, puts this same incident in quite another light. Not the archbishop of Canterbury and the bishop of Winchester come bringing pardon to the poor people (and for this class Holinshed shows far more sympathy than does Shakespeare) but rather the duke of Buckingham and Old Clifford are entrusted with the pardon.

King Henry VI later in this same play says, "blessed are the peacemakers on earth," but Shakespeare shows us only one prelate in the play, and that one is made out in crimson color fitter for Shirley's rapist cardinal, or for Webster's ghastly cardinals in the *Duchess of Malfi* and *The White Devil*. Shakespeare's fabrication of a case against Cardinal Beaufort occupies him so completely that he has no time left to show us other prelates occupied in errands of mercy. In the place, therefore, of the chancellor of the realm, the archbishop of Canterbury, Shakespeare gives us the duke of Buckingham, who addresses the leader of the mob:

Know, Cade, we come ambassadors from the King
Unto the commons whom thou hast misled;
And here pronounce free pardon unto them all
That will forsake thee and go home in peace.

Clifford reinforces the king's offer of pardon, and in this scene he replaces Holinshed's bishop of Winchester:

What say ye, countrymen? Will ye relent
And yield to mercy whilst 'tis offered you,

[23] *1 Henry VI*, V, i, 4-14.

[24] Holinshed's *Chronicles*, Vol. III, p. 226.

> Or let a rebel lead you to your deaths?
> Who loves the King and will embrace his pardon,
> Fling up his cap, and say, "God save his Majesty!"[25]

Clifford then proceeds to extol the memory of that "mirror of Christian Kings," Henry V, and fires the rebels to desert Cade as they recall to mind the exploits of Shakespeare's hero of heroes.

V

Without multiplying instances of this sort, we may conclude that Shakespeare, apparently with cavalier disregard for his sources, snatches away "credit lines" from Holinshed's prelates right and left. Whenever he needs their actions to carry the plot forward, he pushes some caitiff duke out on the stage to speak the part, and scream, "God save his Majesty!" One eminent scholar calls Shakespeare, "no partisan, or satirist, no reformer or propagandist; he stays his hand, lets things be."[26] Perhaps Shakespeare merely manipulates his cards with such consummate skill that the reader finds himself caught unawares while the master slips an ace out of his sleeve.

Shakespeare, in fact, seems to have treated his prelates with the same fine studied contempt that Elizabeth showed the bishop of Ely when she wrote him one of the shortest letters on record: "You know what you were before I made you what you are now. If you do not immediately comply with my request, I will unfrock you, by God."[27] (The bishop complied.)

When the archbishop of York in Shakespeare's *2 Henry IV* dared to present "some parcels and particulars of our grief" to Prince John, he was informed, "there is no need of any such redress; Or if there were it belongs not to you." Elizabeth used almost the same words to her bishops in Parliament: "And you *doctors* [she never dignified them with their ecclesiastical titles], you I understand make long prayers about this business . . . and you must needs be interfering in what does not concern you. . . . The Lords in Parliament should have taught you to know your places; but if they have forgotten their duty, I will not forget mine."[28] Shakespeare got his cue from the right source.

Shakespeare, following his sovereign's good example, expunges, and robs his prelates of whatever little dignity even Holinshed consented to give them, with the exception of Carlisle who is in a special category. The only times they are given an opportunity to talk without testifying against themselves is in scenes where they lie down on the floor and make doormats

[25] *2 Henry VI*, IV, viii, 7-15.
[26] E. E. Stoll, *Shakespeare Studies*, New York, 1927, p. 12.
[27] Wallace Brockway, ed., *A Second Treasury of the World's Great Letters*, New York, 1941, p. 121.
[28] James A. Froude, *The Reign of Elizabeth*, Vol. II, London, n.d., pp. 103-104.

of themselves for the king's pleasure. Consider Cardinal Bourchier, who trundles off to perform as black an errand as mind ever devised at his sovereign's pleasure. Or again, the archbishop of Canterbury in *Henry V,* who is actually allowed to make a few long speeches, but whose sentiments are nevertheless Erastian to the core. In this latter instance, Shakespeare does not even permit the archbishop the questionable joy of having dreamed up the French scheme on his own initiative; rather he is brought on to enunciate a few properly Elizabethan sentiments:

> Therefore doth heaven divide
> The state of man in divers functions,
> Setting endeavor in continual motion;
> To which is fixed, as an aim and butt,
> Obedience.

Obedience, of course, to a king; the honey bees are commended because they teach

> The act of order to a peopled kingdom.
> They have a king.[29]

Shakespeare, who threw off a new play in a fortnight to please Elizabeth when she wanted to see Falstaff in a comedy, had already pleased her mightily, we must assume, in the production of his first two plays dealing with Falstaff: *1* and *2 Henry IV.* He was not a principal shareholder in the company which was the royal favorite acting troupe for nothing; his sentiments are exactly fitted to royal mentality. "There's such divinity doth hedge a king about," Shakespeare later wrote in his most popular tragedy, but the kind of divinity that hedges a churchman about never troubles his mind for an instant.

Why should it have concerned him? Had not Elizabeth suspended an archbishop of Canterbury from the exercise of his office when he dared oppose her will on the "prophesyings" of the clergyman? Had she not disgraced him, and prepared a letter of resignation for him, when he conveniently died?[30] Did she not send out her orders directly to the bishops in despite of the archbishop when he disagreed with her on religious matters? This was the kind of mind-set that Shakespeare was appealing to, and he did a thorough job, sometimes subtly, but always with drastic and telling effect.

It takes no penetrating scholarship to arrive at Alfred Hart's position: "The Tudor scheme of things had no place for members of the church militant." The only English prelate whom Shakespeare ever presents to us as an opponent of the reigning king is Richard Scroop, archbishop of

[29] *Henry V,* I, ii, 184-220. On the importance of the long speech in Shakespeare, see John Q. Adams, *Memorial Studies,* Washington, 1948, p. 60.

[30] W. H. Frere, *The English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I,* London, 1911, pp. 194-195.

York, in *2 Henry IV*. Alfred Hart, who has studied the implications of Archbishop Scroop's conduct in *2 Henry IV* comments: "The passage in which Shakespeare has described the part played by Archbishop Scroop in the rebellion against Henry IV owes very little to Holinshed."[31] And we might add, that all the passages in which Shakespeare has described the parts played by archbishops, whatever they may be doing in the play, owe entirely too little to Holinshed. But let us see just how the changes are effected in the characterization of Archbishop Scroop. Most of the commentators agree that Scroop has been given a poor part to play. He is not even efficient as the leader of a rebellion, and *that* is a crowning insult. His reasons for rebellion are rarely lifted to a loftier plane than mere private revenge for the killing of his brother. He inconsistently berates the common folk in the play, and then builds hopes on them whom he despises for his victory. The "fond many" are pictured as a "beastly feeder" and likened to a "common dog" who would eat up his own dead vomit. This contempt for the common people need not damn him in the Elizabethan scheme of things, but then he finds himself staring at defeat when the crowd of retainers whom Northumberland promised to draw up for the fight in Gaultree forest does not materialize. He comments in one breath,

> Against ill chances men are ever merry,
> But heaviness foreruns the good event,[32]

and in the next breath says,

> Believe me, I am passing light in spirit.

One of the nobles (and the nobles always have far more sense than the prelates) tells him he is inconsistent: for, says Mowbray,

> So much the worse, if your own rule [against ill
> chances are men ever merry] be true.

This prelate then, who as has been said already, is "wise enough to say and to know that

> An habitation giddy, and unsure
> Hath he that buildeth on the vulgar heart,

and yet decided to trust the untrustworthy 'fond many' for success in his rebellion,"[33] this prelate who has the infernal gall to seal, as Shakespeare says it,

> this lawless bloody book
> Of forg'd rebellion with a seal divine,

is the kind of prelate who could have commanded very little sympathy from an Elizabethan audience; and yet as Holinshed presented him he was

[31] Alfred Hart, *Shakespeare and the Homilies*, Melbourne, 1934, p. 62.
[32] *2 Henry IV*, IV, ii, 81-82.
[33] *Ibid., I*, iii, 89-90. See Hart, *op. cit.*, pp. 62-63.

by no means an unsympathetic character. Shakespeare, of course, leaves out the manner of his death. According to Holinshed, "the Archbishop suffered death very constantly, insomuch as the common people took it he died a martyr."[34] The mention of the common people is interesting; Holinshed pictures him as beloved by all. "The gravity of his age, his integrity of life, and incomparable learning, with the reverend aspect of his amiable personage, moved all men to have him in no small estimation."[35] Unmentioned in the source, of course, were such details as the chief justice's refusal to pass sentence on the archbishop, the surpassing grief of the archbishop of Canterbury, who had tried preventing the execution, and the exact details of Scroop's fortitude under the blows of the executioner.[36] Henry at his death lamented the shedding of the blood of his predecessor; Richard, it is to be supposed, was indeed a sacred personage. But King Henry's remorse for the killing of an archbishop, and the sense of the sacredness of "the balm" anointing a prelate never is allowed irrelevantly to obtrude itself into a Shakespearean play.

Whenever attention has been centred upon the character of the archbishop in *2 Henry IV*, it has been customary to point out the differences between the Quarto versions and the First Folio version of this play. The Quartos issued during Shakespeare's lifetime were expurgated of every reference to Richard II. The archbishop's lines were censored with drastic effect. The cuts at several points leave the scenes as Shakespeare conceived them in shambles. It has frequently been assumed that the excision of lines mentioning Richard II, and the drastic reduction of the archbishop's part had contemporary political significance.[37] The licenser of plays acted under order from Elizabeth's appointee, Archbishop Whitgift. Whitgift had no intention of allowing a play to appear in which *any* archbishop appeared as leader of a rebellion. In the expurgated Quartos, the archbishop is just a mere shadow, rather than the leader, albeit a poor one, of a revolt intended to redress wrongs committed by one English king against his predecessor on the throne.

VI

In *King John* a prelate does appear as the leader of a crusade against a slippery king, but the prelate in question is not an Englishman; he is an Italian, and King John hurls a tirade of bitter invective at Italian priests who seek to dominate England. On account of a few changes in the speeches of the Bastard Faulconbridge, it has been assumed in some quar-

[34] Holinshed's *Chronicles*, Vol. III, p. 38.
[35] *Ibid.*, p. 37.
[36] W. W. Capes, *The English Church in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries*, London, 1909, p. 160.
[37] M. A. Shaaber, ed., *New Variorum Shakespeare: Second Part of Henry the Fourth*, Philadelphia, 1940, p. 481.

ters that Shakespeare loved Pandulph and the system he represented a little bit more than he dared say. Shakespeare's source play, *The Troublesome Reign of King John,* which like several other source plays is obviously more talked about than read, presents Pandulph in a better light than does Shakespeare. In *The Troublesome Reign,* which was certainly produced before Shakespeare's play on the same subject, Cardinal Pandulph appears in six scenes, but speaks only a total of 103 lines in the two parts of the play. Contrary to an impression sometimes entertained, *The Troublesome Reign* is very little longer than Shakespeare's so-called compression of it. In *The Troublesome Reign* there are 2,957 lines;[38] in *King John* of Shakespeare there are 2,553 lines. *King John* is the shortest of Shakespeare's history plays. (*Richard III,* the longest of the histories has 3,599.) The actual figures are unimportant, but what does have relevance to our discussion is the comparison of Pandulph's part in the source, and his part in Shakespeare. In the source he has, as we have seen, 103 lines, and the total length of the source is somewhat longer than Shakespeare's play. But in Shakespeare, with a shorter play, he has more lines, 144.

What does he say in the source play? The plot is substantially the same in both plays, but Shakespeare, though using more lines, actually makes him a more sinister character, as we shall see. The plot in both plays hinges upon King John's fight with the church. He is excommunicated and his kingdom interdicted in both plays. Shakespeare presents the cardinal in his first appearance as a full-blown disciple of Mariana's principles: when John refuses to yield he says,

> . . . blessed shall he be that doth revolt
> From his allegiance to an heretic;
> And meritorious shall that hand be call'd,
> Canonized and worshipp'd as a saint,
> That takes away by any secret course
> Thy hateful life.[39]

Pandulph is speaking here the kind of doctrine which Shakespeare's contemporaries, Cardinal Allen and Robert Parsons, the Jesuit, were supposed to be teaching. In the source play, Pandulph says substantially the same thing, but although he excoriates John for his contumacy, he does not so far lose balance as to call revolt and murder anything than by its rightful name, a sin, for which, however, he promises forgiveness from the church. This is a detail of little importance, but forgiveness and canonization are hardly the same thing.[40] When Pandulph drools poison at the mouth in contemplating the murder of Arthur as Shakespeare would have it, the source is restrained. The cardinal in the source does not mention the death

[38] First Part: thirteen scenes, 1,764 lines; Second Part: nine scenes, 1,193 lines.
[39] *King John,* III, i, 174-179.
[40] See *The Troublesome Reign* in *Six Old Plays,* Vol. II, London, 1799, p. 250.

of Arthur, although he may foresee it. Shakespeare gives Pandulph thirty-five lines to say what the source play has him say in eight lines. By the time Shakespeare has collected these buckets of poison dripped from Pandulph's mouth, he has prepared us for more significant twists in the character of this crafty prince of the church. In the source, John submits, and Pandulph tells the French Dauphin

> Thy forwardness to fight for holy Rome
> Shall be remunerated to the full.[41]

Cold comfort, of course, for the hot-tempered French, but in Shakespeare Pandulph does not promise remuneration; he simply tells the Dauphin to quit fighting, and that is all there is to it. Pandulph's last words in Shakespeare are, "Give me leave to speak." He has, of course, already damned himself past redemption. But the Bastard Faulconbridge interrupts him, "No, I will speak." And speaks *he* does, and at length, and convincingly. But in the source Pandulph comes back again at the scene of John's death. Shakespeare, of course, excludes the English friars, monk, and abbot, who appear in the source, because he wants all John's enmity with the church to appear the result of foreign interventionism. No one must infer that John is hounded by English churchmen—his troubles are with Italians. The monk who kills John says in the source play,

> Is this the man that robbed the holy church?
> And yet will fly to a friary?

Then he says to himself,

> Be thou the man to set thy country free,
> And murder him that seeks to murder thee.[42]

When John is dying, Pandulph comes on, and says,

> Lords, give me leave to joy the dying king,
> With sight of these his nobles kneeling here
> With daggers in their hands, who offer up
> Their lives for ransom of their foul offence.
> Then good my lord, if you forgive them all,
> Lift up your hand in token you forgive.[43]

What havoc these words would have wreaked with Shakespeare's conception of the man! Here he is bringing around the nobles who have learned to hate their treachery! And he speaks of joying the dying king! Pandulph's next speech must also be quoted in full:

[41] *Six Old Plays*, Vol. II, p. 299.
[42] *Ibid.*, p. 305.
[43] *Ibid.*, p. 313.

> King John, farewell: in token of thy faith,
> And sign thou diest the servant of the Lord,
> Lift up thy hand, that we may witness here,
> Thou diest the servant of our Saviour Christ.
> Now joy betide thy soul.[44]

In the source play John has the character of a David out of whose loins shall spring a kingly branch, and we find it somewhat amusing to contemplate the implied analogy of Henry VIII with Jesus Christ. But be that as it may, our essential business here is with Pandulph, not John, and it appears certain that Pandulph in the source play is much nearer to Shakespeare's bishop of Carlisle, his only bishop who commends anyone who "fought for Jesu Christ . . . and gave . . . his pure soul unto his captain, Christ."[45] But never could we for one moment imagine Shakespeare's Pandulph talking of "Our Saviour Christ," and solacing with spiritual comfort a dying king. One other interesting observation before we quit Pandulph: his last speech in *The Troublesome Reign* is a stout defense of Prince Henry's right of succession to the throne. His appearance as Protector of the young prince is a more advantageous posture for him to assume than the last one in which Shakespeare places him. At the very end of Shakespeare's play, Cardinal Pandulph (not on stage) is within at rest. *Requiescat in pace,* after all the vitriol he has at Shakespeare's behest dropped from his lips during the course of the play.

VII

Because Shakespeare's dexterity is so absolutely overwhelming, not a few readers have come away with the impression that "Shakespeare does not assert himself as do his contemporaries in drama . . . we cannot easily make . . . out his likes or dislikes. . . . He is too fair, too tolerant, too indulgent."[46] Would that there were evidence for his halcyon view of Shakespeare's indulgence in the treatment of his most extensive portrait of a cardinal, Henry Beaufort. Beaufort, according to Holinshed, was no "Jack out of office," obtruding himself upon the king, Henry VI, stealing him away, and then pushing "at chiefest stern of public weal."[47] Rather Henry V had selected Henry Beaufort as godfather for his son, as Holinshed tells us, and "the custody of this young prince was appointed to Thomas, Duke of Exeter, and to Henry Beaufort, Bishop of Winchester."[48] Here is Holinshed's opinion of Henry VI (and Hall carries substantially the same words):

[44] *Ibid.,* p. 314.
[45] *Richard II,* IV, i, 92-99.
[46] E. E. Stoll, *op. cit.,* p. 12.
[47] *1 Henry VI,* I, i, 175-177.
[48] Holinshed's *Chronicles,* Vol. III, p. 136.

He was plain, upright, far from fraud, wholly given to prayer, reading of Scriptures and alms-deeds. . . . He did abhor all the vices of body and soul, and from his very infancy, he was of honest conversation and pure integrity; no knower of evil, and a keeper of goodness.[49]

Shakespeare cannot so alter his source material as to call Henry VI an evil person, but he so manipulates him that the audience will agree his churchlike humours do *not* fit him for a crown. But if he cannot change the king, he has no intention of letting Beaufort appear as Henry V's *own choice* of a guardian for his infant son. Shakespeare, who presents Beaufort as the evillest character on stage, can hardly afford to tell his audience that this monster was Henry V's own choice of a godfather. Gloucester strikes the note which Shakespeare sounds fortissimo through the remainder of the two plays, *1* and *2 Henry VI,* when he snarls at Beaufort,

> Presumptuous priest! . . . such is thy
> audacious wickedness,
> Thy lewd, pestiferous, and dissentious pranks,
> As very infants prattle of thy pride.
> Thou art a most pernicious usurer;
> Froward by nature, enemy to peace;
> Lascivious, wanton. . . .[50]

Gloucester works himself up into a fine Pauline lather, and strings together a list of epithets that would have done credit to the apostle himself. When Henry later quotes Scripture to urge peace between Gloucester and Beaufort, Beaufort calls for a sword. According to Shakespeare, Beaufort asserts he will never yield. At last after infinite skirmishing, Gloucester, excellent Christian soul, offers Beaufort his hand in token of peace.[51] Beaufort still refuses it; the king reminds him that he has often preached against the sin of malice, and commands him to practice what he preaches. Beaufort still hesitates, but finally makes a show of yielding. In an aside Gloucester says, "So help me God, as I dissemble not!" Beaufort immediately counters with another aside, "So help me God, as I intend it not!"[52]

In Holinshed, on the other hand, it is Beaufort who initiates the peace drive, and there is no suggestion that he is insincere.[53] No evidence in Holinshed, furthermore, has been found for Shakespeare's saying he obtained a cardinalate by a bribe.[54] There is no authority in Holinshed for stating that Beaufort set the necromancer, two priests, and a witch, on Dame Eleanor Cobham.[55] Furthermore, there is no warrant from Holinshed

[49] *Ibid.,* Vol. III, p. 325.
[50] *1 Henry VI,* III, i, 8 and 14-19.
[51] *Ibid.,* III, i, 126.
[52] *Ibid.,* III, i, 140-141.
[53] W. G. Boswell-Stone, *Shakespeare's Holinshed,* New York, 1896, p. 22.
[54] *Ibid.,* p. 236.
[55] Holinshed's *Chronicles,* Vol. III, pp. 203-204. Notice also that Queen Margaret was not even in England. She was not married to Henry VI, according to the *Chronicles,* until two years later. Dame Eleanor Cobham could hardly have threatened Margaret's "beauty with her nails," and have executed revenge upon her whom she had not yet seen (*2 Henry VI,* I, iii, 140-150).

"for assuming Cardinal Beaufort had anything to do with Gloucester's death."[56] This pleasantry was hatched, according to Holinshed, in the fertile brain of the magpie from France, Queen Margaret.[57] This is quite a staggering total of differences between Shakespeare and his source; were the "immortal bard" kinder to his other prelates, we might assume a dramatic necessity, or a lost intermediate source, but his manner is seen in the transformation. Here was a priest who garnered political power, and so he must be pilloried.

The death of Beaufort has excited oh's and ah's from the commentators. Of course, he deserves just such a terrible end, if he is the foul creature Shakespeare makes him out to be. Hall draws quite a different picture of the death of Beaufort, brother of Henry IV: the dying cardinal laments, "I thought to increase my treasure in hope to have worn a triple crown. But I see now the world faileth me, and I am deceived: praying you all to pray for me."[58] The chroniclers picture Beaufort as "more noble in blood than notable in learning, haughty . . . rich above measure, but not very liberal."[59] Both Hall and Holinshed condemn him for his ambitious purpose, "aspiring to ascend to the papistical see." What modern historians say of Beaufort is irrelevant, but it seems noteworthy that he comes off as a very generous supporter of Henry V's pet projects. How would Shakespeare have felt towards his creature had he known that Beaufort was financier for the French wars?[60]

Richard III, which can only be considered briefly, lists three prelates in the cast of characters: Rotherham, archbishop of York, who proves a mere cipher (in Holinshed, of course, this whole episode of the giving up of the seal to Queen Elizabeth is made much of);[61] Cardinal Bouchier, archbishop of Canterbury, who hobbles off to fulfill the persuasion of his royal master (in Holinshed the cardinal, who is a dotard of eighty, thinks he can afford the little prince better protection);[62] and Morton, bishop of Ely, who has nothing more important to do on stage than running after strawberries (Holinshed makes him the prime mover in the marriage of Richmond and Elizabeth, and a great foe to Richard).[63] None of these characters, of course, can be amplified in a play that is so much a one-man show as is this one. Richard gives one or two "credit lines" to his strawberry-raising prelate:

[56] Holinshed's *Chronicles,* Vol. III, p. 211.

[57] *Ibid.,* Vol. III, p. 210—"This toy entered first into her brain through her own imagination."

[58] Hall's *Chronicle,* London, 1809, p. 211.

[59] Holinshed's *Chronicles,* Vol. III, p. 212. See also Hall's *Chronicle,* p. 210.

[60] K. B. McFarlane, "Henry V, Bishop Beaufort, and the Red Hat," the *English Historical Review,* Vol. LX, No. 238 (September, 1945), pp. 316-348.

[61] Holinshed's *Chronicles,* Vol. III, pp. 368-369.

[62] *Ibid.,* Vol. III, pp. 376-377.

[63] *Ibid.,* Vol. III, pp. 404, 406, 412-413.

Ely with Richmond troubles me more near
Than Buckingham and his rash-levied strength.[64]

[Richmond] stirr'd up by Dorset, Buckingham, and
Morton, [bishop of Ely]
. . . makes for England, here to claim the crown.[65]

Morton's part in the unseating of usurping Richard, in the "joining gentlemen together in the aid of King Henry [VII], devising first the marriage between him and King Edward's daughter . . . with infinite good to the realm by the conjunction of these two bloods in one,"[66] occupies considerable space in the sources, Holinshed and Hall. But the excisions of Morton from *Richard III* and Arundel from *Richard II* follow such identical patterns that it would be repetitious to go over the same tortuous trail in detailed fashion this late in the day.

VIII

At the beginning of our treatment we called attention to the paucity of ecclesiastical personages in the historical plays. There are, as we have indicated, more prelates appearing in *Henry VIII* than in any of the other plays attributed to Shakespeare. Interestingly enough Shakespeare's coauthor in *Henry VIII* was (according to received opinion) John Fletcher, the son of a bishop of London. Fletcher's father, moreover, was a typical cut of Elizabethan prelate, obsequious to the queen, but often negligent of his spiritual functions. The thesis of *Henry VIII* was copied from Holinshed: Wolsey hated Queen Katharine, and intrigued to plant suspicion of the legality of the marriage in Henry's mind. Wolsey was disappointed by the emperor's refusal to endow him with the fabulous temporalities of the bishopric of Toledo as a prelude to the tiara, and in part his revenge on the emperor was played on the emperor's kinswoman, Katharine. Henry comes off with fine colors flying; the onus of the divorce idea is dumped into the lap of the proud butcher's son. Not much can be made of Shakespeare's contributions to the play. Supposedly he wrote the lines Henry speaks to Cranmer:

My learn'd and well-beloved servant Cranmer,
Prithee return. With thy approach, I know,
My comfort comes along.[67]

Henry has already decided to divorce Katharine. "I may perceive these Cardinals [Wolsey and Campeius] trifle with me."[68] The alternative

[64] *Richard III*, IV, iii, 49-50.
[65] *Ibid.*, IV, iv, 467-468.
[66] Holinshed's *Chronicles*, Vol. III, p. 404.
[67] *Henry VIII*, II, iv, 238-240. For attribution of these lines to Shakespeare, see Marjorie H. Nicolson, "The Authorship of Henry the Eighth" in *P M L A*, Vol. XXXVII, No. 3 (September, 1922), p. 495. Notice also her comments on p. 498 in support of the thesis of the present paper: "In the parts which I have called Shakespearean, there are only three references of any sort to the Church, and those are entirely subsidiary . . . there is nothing to suggest that Shakespeare was interested, in the slightest degree, in the question of religion . . . that misunderstanding has arisen from various references in the Fletcherian scenes."
[68] *Ibid.*, II, iv, 236.

title of *Henry VIII,* which seems to have been written as a *pièce d'occasion* for a royal wedding celebration, was *All Is True.* It may have been an answer to a flagrant misrepresentation of certain facts of Henry VIII's reign contained in a play previously acted, Samuel Rowley's bowdlerization: *When You See Me You Know Me.*[69] Rowley's play is an egregious hash: it does crowd on bishops right and left, all eager to discuss with Prince Edward and King Henry the fine points of religion. Elizabeth is pictured adjuring her brother to stand fast in the faith; Mary Tudor writes him a small treatise on theology. Wycliffe's name and doctrine, Luther's name and doctrine, the teachings of the "papistical see," are all bandied about in an unconscionable farrago of religious nonsense. "Bishops to the right of me, bishops to the left of me," carry on their theological debates, evidently with some pleasure to the audience. (This play was printed four times before the Closing of the Theatres.)

IX

Sir John Oldcastle, 1600, appeared as a play for the Lord Admiral's men; the references to the character of Falstaff (two in number) establish the play as in part, at least, a rejoinder. "Oldcastle died a martyr," Shakespeare said, at the end of *2 Henry IV.* The play, *Sir John Oldcastle,* centres in the religious implications of the Lollard movement. This play, thought to be in part by Drayton,[70] obviously seeks to cash in on the success of *1* and *2 Henry IV.* The action centres in the conflict between the bishop of Rochester and Oldcastle. Unlike Beaufort's conflict with Gloucester in *1* and *2 Henry VI,* Oldcastle is persecuted for religious reasons. Holinshed's accounts of the religious crisis precipitated during the reigns of Henry IV and Henry V is not even accorded so much as a by-line in Shakespeare's play, and yet a strictly contemporary play touching exactly the same period is replete from beginning to end with discussion of Wycliffism! What we are attempting to imply in mentioning as examples Rowley's play and Drayton's play is simply this: there was an audience for plays on the same subjects Shakespeare chose, an audience glad to see the religious phases of history accorded the same emphasis in drama that Holinshed and his predecessor, Hall, gave these same religious phases in their chronicles. Since Shakespeare expurgates the prelates whom he portrays, removing any slightest cognizance of the pressing religious disputes involved in Lollardry (*Henry V*), Lutheranism (*Henry VIII*), we may surmise Shakespeare's disinterest in the technicalities of religion,

[69] Samuel Rowley, *When You See Me You Know Me,* The Tudor Facsimile Texts, 1912 (reproduction of 1613 edition). Marjorie H. Nicolson in her article, "The Authorship of Henry the Eighth," p. 489, has commented on the "pronounced revival of interest in these plays [*When You See Me You Know Me* and *If You Know Not Me You Know Nobody*] during the year 1613."

[70] C. F. Tucker Brooke, *The Shakespeare Apocrypha,* Oxford, 1908, p. xxvii.

his studied aloofness from matters strictly religious, forming thus a pattern of thought.

Other history plays written before the Closing of the Theatres which afford suitable comparison with Shakespeare's histories might include Thomas Heywood's *If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody* (1606), Dekker and Webster's *Famous History of Sir Thomas Wyatt* (1607), and John Ford's *Perkin Warbeck* (1634). Heywood includes an elaborate dumb show with Winchester [cardinal] and friars competing with two guardian angels sent to protect the queen.[71] Elizabeth, who is pictured as inordinately fond of the Bible, kisses "the Book"[72] at the slightest provocation, and expounds divinity with a zeal not unworthy of her learned father.

Dekker and Webster in *Sir Thomas Wyatt* picture Winchester pleading,

> May it please your grace to give release
> Unto such ancient Bishops that have lost their
> Honours in the church affairs.[73]

Winchester himself never allows anyone to forget that "I am a Pillar of the Mother Church."[74] Wyatt later protests in his defense, "I have no Bishop's Rochet to declare my innocency."[75] Queen Mary, of course, talks at length in the play on the subject of religion and "the ancient honours due unto the Church."[76]

John Ford, simply to specify with another example of a different perspective on churchmen from that of Shakespeare, allows Urswick, chaplain to King Henry VII, along with the bishop of Durham, a principal part in evolving the grand strategy for defeating the upstart rebel, Perkin Warbeck. Bishop Fox, in particular, suggests the marriage between King James of Scotland and Margaret, Henry's daughter, and induces James to dismiss Perkin.[77] James says, "Obedience to mother church . . . directs our wisdom to seal an oath of peace through Christendom."[78] This is exactly the kind of credit line Shakespeare never gave a political churchman, as we have amply seen, in our previous discussion of Shakespeare's procedures.

X

Shakespeare, the most quoted poet, supplies no quotable gems on the life and death of Christ. Marlowe gives us these lines:

[71] Thomas Heywood, *The Dramatic Works of Thomas Heywood,* Vol. I, London, 1874, p. 228.
[72] *Ibid.*, p. 246.
[73] Thomas Dekker and John Webster, *The Famous History of Sir Thomas Wyatt,* Tudor Facsimile Text, 1914, p. 21.
[74] *Ibid.*, p. 45.
[75] *Ibid.*, p. 45.
[76] *Ibid.*, pp. 20-21.
[77] John Ford, *The Best Plays,* ed. Havelock Ellis, London, n.d., p. 442.
[78] *Ibid.*, p. 442. (*Perkin Warbeck,* Act IV, Scene III.)

> See, see where Christ's blood streams in the firmament!
> One drop would save my soul—half a drop: ah my Christ! . . .
> O God!
> If thou wilt not have mercy on my soul,
> Yet for Christ's sake whose blood hath ransomed me,
> Impose some end to my incessant pain. . . .[79]

The contrast in specificity in Marlowe and Shakespeare is the point; when Cardinal Beaufort dies, as Shakespeare conceives him, he is equally a damned soul. Here presumably would have been a suitable spot for the cardinal to have become specific on the subject of heaven and hell; Marlowe damns his Faustus caught in the clutches of death just as certainly as does Shakespeare his cardinal, but Marlowe, the supposed atheist, gets off a far greater deal of talk of the specifically religious kind than does Shakespeare. For Shakespeare in the analogous scene, God is the "eternal Mover of the heavens,"[80] and here, as elsewhere, he seems to euphemize, without ever saying anything that conveys a specifically Christian tone.

Certainly as far as the prelates are concerned, Shakespeare chooses either to ignore them or to defame them. A study of his sources and a comparison of his treatment of historical themes with contemporary plays on the same themes indicates that he minimizes the influence of religious currents in history.

His treatment of his prelates, where they are introduced, suggests sympathy for Erastian views. A check list of his allusions reveals that he used 137 technical terms relating to music,[81] an almost equal number of technical terms relating to hawking, and a sizable list of technical terms relating to the law. There are at most a dozen technical terms of a distinctively religious nature.[82]

Shakespeare's mind set was distinctively secular, we feel. As a dramatist he showed considerably less sympathy for the classic dogmatic concepts, if we are to judge his interests from allusions found in his plays, than did contemporary dramatists such as Marlowe. And certainly as a poet (irrelevant though it may be to consider him in that category), he exhibited considerably less sympathy for the classic dogmatic concepts than did other contemporary poets such as Spenser. He stands in marked contrast to the other chief poets of the language, Chaucer and Milton, in his attentiveness to religious forces.

On the other hand, the distinctively secular cast of mind undoubtedly brings him closer to our own day. His universality of appeal may in part derive from that very absence of "church-mindedness" which his treatment of the cardinals and bishops in the history plays demonstrates with such devastating effect.

[79] Marlowe, *The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus,* Scene XVI, 78-79, 97-100.
[80] *2 Henry VI,* III, iii, 19.
[81] *Shakespeare's England,* Vol. II, Oxford, 1916, pp. 32-49.
[82] *Ibid.,* Vol. I, p. 69.

WHAT YOU OUGHT TO DO IS IMPOSSIBLE

DONALD A. WELLS

The State College of Washington

One of the most pertinent signs of the decay of ethical principle and practice is the notion that what you ought to do cannot be done. A recent convocation speaker maintained this position. His dilemma was this: "We ought not to support Franco or de Gaulle because they are against high principle; but we must support them because it is the only practical thing to do." What is right in principle is wrong in practice, while what is wrong in principle is now right in practice. What an ethically frustrating position for modern man to be in! What he ought to do can't be done, and what he shouldn't do must be done. Is it any wonder that principles seem platitudinous and practice seems reprehensible to so many.

If we lived in a vacuum, such a problem might justifiably remain as a clever dilemma to confound sophomores in formal logic. Inasmuch as we live in society where actions must follow even when based on wrong premises, such *ignoratio elenchi* cannot be tolerated.

I

This attitude follows naturally the decadent thinking of logical positivism. Ever since Occam fell into the snare of nominalism, and Bacon turned this worship of the sensually concrete into a science, the status of value judgments has steadily declined. It remained for the English agnostics to wed Humean skepticism with Kantian subjectivism and rear the sterile movement known as logical positivism.

Logical positivism maintains that all propositions or facts must be subjected to two tests of validity. First, they may be verified by the senses. This is what Carnap calls "confrontation of a statement with observation."[1] Naturally this has meaning for objects in the space-time world. Second, a proposition may be shown to be tautologous *i.e.*, an arbitrary definition which could with equal cogency be defined in the opposite fashion. Propositions in the first category are demonstrably reality. Those in the second are demonstrably whimsy. This strikes a fatal blow at ethics. Inasmuch as value propositions cannot be sensed, they are arbitrary opinions which have no necessary relation to the real world.

Other philosophical movements have started with the same premises. The school called semantics under the guise of promoting clarity of definitions reduced all knowable facts to sense objects. Ogden and Richards,

[1] Rudolf Carnap, "Meaningfulness and Confirmation," in Herbert Feigl and Wilfrid Sellars, *Readings in Philosophical Analysis*, p. 124.

Korzybski, Chase, and Hayakawa, incensed at the amphibolous use of words, performed *hara kiri* on language by emancipating it from all generalizations and all value propositions. Once the body of language had been bled of all universals (and language consists of universals) and eviscerated of the value core, naught remained but the dead carcass of the specious present. All that remained to be talked about was a collection of intuited sensations. When Hume had reduced thinking to such an association of discrete particulars, he had perspicacity enough to observe that he had explained everything except thinking (a rather basic omission).

As if these two movements were not sufficient to suggest to man that values were tenuous and illogical at the core, a companion ideology frequently under the guise of religion read the obituary of any last hope for a rational basis of values. Based on the facts of increasingly inhumane wars, callousness to human suffering, and the revocation of human rights, this new group, called existentialists, concluded that man was a dismal ethical failure. This suggested a fact obvious to the existentialists that human reason was so fallible as to be incapable of making valid value judgments or of solving the problems of human relations. It is scarcely a positivistic sense datum from this to the recognition that what ought to be done can't be done. The reason is simple. Value judgments are fatuous verbiage. There is no truth in them.

II

It may be that the defender of the position that the ought is impossible has not sold his rationale of value for a mess of "brute facts." Rather he has posited the timeworn dichotomy of Plato between the ideal and the real or the Cartesian "bifurcation" between the ideal and the material. Instead of saying that values are illogical and therefore impractical, he professes the theory that they are so different from this material world in which we live that they cannot be applied without distortion. Formless, essenceless ideals must get soiled with the taint of matter if they are to be applied. Naturally the ought cannot be obeyed. What ought to be done is "way up there" while what we must do is "way down here." Up is up and down is down and never the twain do meet.

This Platonic emphasis has had a long and revered history under the ægis of religious philosophy. It was a natural inference for religionists to make after absolving God of the trials and tribulations of this world and redefining Jesus such that he had none of the earthy, to conclude that the good life was also in a different category from this life. The ethics of this world became interim theory while the truly good life was beyond this world. Men thought of themselves as pilgrims in a weary and dismal land. Hope for improvement in this life was futile. Centuries of religious

reaction followed wherein the "good" people gave up attempts to ameliorate this world. After all, the moral ought cannot be practiced here.

This thought was carried further by seventeenth- and eighteenth-century British thinkers who maintained that it was not only senseless to seek improvement for society but sinful. Under the robe of religion social reformers were attacked as defilers of the purity of the good. If men hoped to push back disease or poverty, they were branded as infidels. The good life was not intended for this world, and any who attempted to fit goodness into this scheme of things were either ignorant or malicious.

Such a doctrine of reaction was adopted by many as a matter of common sense. We find Andrew Carnegie at the turn of the twentieth century viewing the social scene frankly and observing:

> We accept and welcome, therefore, as conditions to which we must accommodate ourselves, great inequality of environment; the concentration of business, industrial and commercial, in the hands of the few.[2]

This conclusion gave befuddled men surcease from the growing awareness that this world was in a rather sorry plight. Freed from the need to deceive himself with thinking that this was a good world run by a good God, he could now openly admit the presence and practice of great social evils and explain them as the best a bad world can do. The utopias of what ought to be done are dreams never to become real.

III

Perhaps both of these arguments have been avoided and still it seems oppressingly true that what ought to be done cannot be done. The harassing fact remains that it is difficult to make the ideal actual, and this difficulty becomes tantamount to a confession of impossibility. Under the protection of the difficulty involved, religionists and social scientists frequently avoid social application. As a matter of fact "difficult" puts it too mildly. Social action is fearfully hazardous. The risks of making a mistake may be of world consequence; the chance of being right may bring world blessings.

And this is not all. Application of ideals to practice has always been dangerous; but when reaction holds the social fort, those who attempt to apply melioristic ideals to practice become subversive. Is it any wonder that many social thinkers hesitate to apply principle to practice when they stand a good chance of being branded by some watchdog of reaction as a threat to the peace? How consoling this idea can be. If one can make a mountain out of the risk, others may make a molehill out of inactivity. The next logical step is to proclaim that what ought be done cannot be done.

Perhaps human nature poses an insuperable obstacle. The writer of

[2] Andrew Carnegie, *The Gospel of Wealth*, p. 4.

Ecclesiastes said "concerning the estate of the sons of men . . . they themselves are beasts."[3] St. Paul concluded that there was something structural in man to account for this inability to do good. "They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one."[4]

If man is as hopeless a creature as this, it is but a slight variation to the tenet of Aristotle: "It is clear, then, that some men are by nature free, and other slaves, and that for these latter slavery is both expedient and right."[5] We began by suggesting that men were thoughtless and callous and we end by making this inhumanity a necessary evil. Understandably, then, what ought to be done is one thing, what can be done is quite another.

IV

Whether one puts ideals in the realm of the illogical, the otherworldly, or the impossible, the social consequences are clear; instead of being guided by ideals as objectives, one is led on by expedient pleasures and wants unrelated to ideals. The assumption follows that since our professed ideal won't work, what we do work shall become our ideal. In society this has commonly resulted in a dog-eat-dog struggle for personal survival as well as for personal aggrandizement. While it is recognized that the "war of all against all" is not good, it is maintained that this wolf philosophy is natural. Altruism may be the ideal good, but selfishness is the inevitable practice. At least logical positivism is frank in saying that value judgments are nonsense. We won't work ourselves into a frenzy of frustration trying to apply nonsense ideals. This much cannot be said for the school which admonishes us to be good when goodness is defined as impossible; or commands us to be virtuous when original sin has been defined as an inescapable obstacle.

[3] Eccl. 3:18-19.
[4] Rom. 3:12.
[5] Aristotle, *Politics*, I, ii, 15.

THE USE OF MARGINAL NOTES IN THE ENGLISH BIBLE

ALLEN WIKGREN
The University of Chicago

THE MARGIN in the English Bible has had a variable, interesting, and sometimes exciting and significant history. Recognition of the fact that it is impossible completely to translate from one language to another and of the fact that the translation of an ancient document especially needs some elucidation to facilitate understanding of it by the reader has often led editors and translators of the Bible to use marginal notes of one kind or another to render the text intelligible. What to place in the margin, however, has always been a problem to the translator. Readers have reacted differently to *marginalia*, some looking to them for help, others preferring no notes at all. Ussher's chronology practically attained the status of inspired Scripture among readers of the later editions of the King James Version!

Marginal notes have been of five main types:

1. Textual: The citation of important textual variants.
2. Translational: (a) The citation of a literal rendering of the original language when the translation departs from it more than usual; (b) Alternative renderings of uncertain or problematic passages.
3. Explanatory: The explanation of obscure terms, ancient measurements, plays on words, historical and geographical references, etc.
4. Interpretative: Observations and inferences of an appreciative, devotional, or theological (sometimes polemical) nature.
5. Referential: Cross references to passages in the Old and New Testaments. The nature and extent of these are related to theological presuppositions.

While we shall have something to say about these various categories of notes, our chief interest in this treatment is in the history of those which fall into the fourth group. This type of marginal commentary played an interesting part in the earliest history of the English Bible. It may, indeed, be not too much to say that in the turbulent scenes of sixteenth-century England it exerted an influence upon the very course of events, political as well as ecclesiastical.

The English Bible, in its earliest, written Anglo-Saxon form, really began as a marginal or interlinear gloss accompanying the Latin text. Some of the primitive attempts at English translation also took the form of paraphrases, and others, like Rolle's Psalter, were themselves accompanied by an English gloss. It had been a common practice to add marginal notes in Latin manuscripts, and when the Wycliffite versions were pro-

duced (1380-1384) several contained such *marginalia,*[1] chiefly of the "interpretative" variety. The other types had their inception mainly in the printed Bible, and, with the exception of the "interpretative" and "referential," experienced a continuous growth up to the Revised Version. The latter were at that time decreased in quantity. The former, after a brief but stormy career, passed out of existence so far as the "authorized" Bibles were concerned with the King James Version of 1611.

The ultimate removal of the "interpretative" notes was due to the controversial or polemical nature of many of them. In William Tyndale's quarto edition of the New Testament of 1525, which contained about ninety notes, glosses of this kind appeared, to judge by the thirty-one leaf fragment of Matthew which is extant and by various vituperative allusions to Tyndale's work by certain illustrious contemporaries. The notes in his Pentateuchal books were the more strongly polemical, as, *e.g.,* in Exod. 36:6: "When will the pope say hoo, and forbid to offere for the bylding of saint Paters chyrch; and when will our spiritualitie say hoo, and forbid to geve the(m) more londe, a(n)d to make moe fu(n)dacions? neuer verely vntill they haue all"; or the oft-quoted one on Exod. 32:35: "The popis bull sleeth moo tha(n) Aarons calfe. . . ." Another may be cited from Lev. 21:5: "Of the hethe(n) preastes therfore toke our prelates the ensample of their balde pates."

Tyndale's translational and exegetical efforts provoked some noteworthy reactions. King Henry VIII, in reply to a letter of Luther's, denounces his correspondent and speaks of him as having fallen

> in deuyce with one or two leude persons, borne in this our realme, for the translatying of the Newe testament in to Englysshe, as well with many corruptions of that holy text, as certayne prefaces, and other pestylent gloses in the margentes, for the advaunce-ment and settyng forthe of his abhomynable heresyes, etc.[2]

A letter of Robert Ridley to Bishop Henry Gold of London, written about 1527, contains the following similar observation:

> Maister gold I hartly commaunde me vnto you, as concernyng this common & vulgare translation of the new testament in to englishe, doon by M. William hichyns, other wais called M. W. tyndale & frear William roy, manifest lutheranes heretikes & apostates, as doth opynly apeir not only by their daily & continuall company & familiarite with Luther & his disciples, but mych mor by their comentares & annotations in Mathew & Marcum, in the first print, also by their preface in the 2d prent, & by their introduccion in to the epistle of paule ad romanes, al to gither most posoned & abhominable hereses that can be thowht, etc.[3]

[1] See Jacob I. Mombert, *A Handbook of the English Versions of the Bible* (2d ed., New York, A. D. F. Randolph, 1890), p. 70, for some examples.

[2] Alfred W. Pollard, *Records of the English Bible . . . 1525-1611* (London, New York, etc., Oxford University Press, 1911), p. 118.

[3] *Ibid.,* p. 122.

An extract from "A dyaloge of syr Thomas More" (1529) has this reference:

> For now yt ys to be consydered that at the tyme of thys translacyon hychens was wyth Luther in wyttenberge, and set certayne glosys in the mergent, framed for the settyng forthe of that vngracious sect.[4]

Finally, we cite an Episcopal prohibition by Bishop Tunstall of London, issued in 1526, which, after denouncing the new translation with the usual liberal assortment of derogatory adjectives, goes on to say that

> of the whiche translation there are many bokes imprinted, some with gloses and some without, conteining in the english tongue that pestiferous and most pernicious poyson dispersed throughout all our dioces of London in great nomber, . . .[5]

In Tyndale's well-known 1534 edition of the New Testament and the Pentateuch the glosses were toned down. Indeed, he apparently offered to return to England and submit to the king ". . . if it wolde stande withe the kinges most gracious pleasure to graunte only a bare text of the scriptures . . ."[6]

The following Coverdale and "authorized" versions generally adjusted themselves to the mood of king and clergy by limiting or omitting interpretative notes, especially of a controversial nature. This was true of the Coverdale Bible of 1535, in which only sixty-six notes occur.[7] An exception is provided by the Matthew's Bible of 1537, for, although it was licensed by some interesting political-ecclesiastical hocus pocus, it contained a good number of Tyndale's polemical—especially antipapal—notes. Some editions also included his prologues. In printings after 1540, however, the notes were all left out. The Taverner Bible of 1539 had only a very few explanatory *marginalia*.

In the first authorized English Bible, the Great Bible of 1539, all marginal notes except cross references and brief chapter summaries were dropped, as might well be expected. This represents a culmination of the reaction against controversial and polemical remarks. It should be noted, however, that *marginalia* were projected for this edition, Coverdale, who had the work in charge, considering them to be a necessary part of the undertaking. In a letter written to Cromwell and dated December 13, 1538, he inquires whether he is to proceed with the annotations or not, and makes this lament:

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 129.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 134.
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 170.
[7] See John Eadie, *The English Bible* (London, Macmillan, 1876), I, pp. 287-292, for a reproduction. It has been shown by Westcott, *A General View of the History of the English Bible* (3rd ed., revised by W. A. Wright, New York and London, Macmillan, 1905), that the sources of these are the same as the "fyve sundry interpreters" to which Coverdale refers his text, usually identified as the Zurich Swiss-German Bible of Zwingli and Leo Juda, Luther, Pagninus' Latin Bible, the Vulgate, and Tyndale.

Pitie it were, that the darck places of the text (ypon the which I haue allwaye set a hande ☞) shulde so passe vndeclared. As for anye pryuate opynion or contencious wordes, as I wyll utterly avoyde all soche, so wyll I offre the annotacions first to my sayde lord of Herdforde; to the intent that he shall so examen the same, afore they be put in prynte. . . .[8]

From Foxe's *Acts and Monumentes* comes also a pertinent observation:

In this Bible, although the former notes of Thomas Mathew was omitted, yet sondry markes and handes were annexed in the sides, which ment that in those places shuld be made certeine notes, wherwith also the clergy was offended, though the notes were not made.[9]

The account goes on to indicate that Grafton the printer, upon being questioned, stated that he had stayed the projected notes when he discovered that king and clergy were opposed to them, but was sentenced to six weeks in the fleet for his intentions. To be sure, the markers themselves may have been sufficient offense, for the affronted groups had come to know what might be expected opposite certain passages. It was like distributing marked copies of the Sermon on the Mount in war time. The preface to the Bible itself also makes reference to the proposed notes in the following manner:

We haue also (as ye maye se) added many handes, both in the mergent of thys volume and also in the text, upon the which we purposed to haue made, in the ende of the Byble (in a table by themselues), certen godly annotacions: but for so moch as yet there hath not bene soffycient tyme minystred to the kynges moost honorable councell for the ouersyght and correccyon of the sayde annotacyons, we wyll therfore omyt them tyll their more conuenie(n)t leysour, doyng now no more but beseke thee, moost gentle reader, that when thou commest at soch a place where a hande doth stande (or any other where, in the Byble), and thou canst not attayne to the meanynge and true knowledge of that sentence, then do not rashly presume to make any pryuate interpretacyon thereof: but submyt thy selfe to the iudgement of those that are godly learned in Christ Jesu.

The fear of private interpretation of the Scriptures, inherited from Rome by the Church of England, is also reflected in the king's proclamation of May 6, 1541, on setting up the Bible in the churches. The people were urged to read it, but were also admonished

to avoid all contention, altercation therin, and to use an honest sobrietye in the inquisition of the true sense of the same, and referre th'explication of obscure places, to men of higher jugment in Scripture.[10]

Another draft forbids disputations in alehouses and taverns. The prefatory reference to the proposed *marginalia,* or to what appears to be a compromise arrangement of a table of notes, and the indicators were retained in

[8] Pollard, *op. cit.,* p. 245.
[9] *Ibid.,* p. 229.
[10] *Ibid.,* p. 262.

three editions of this Bible (1539-1540), after which they were dropped. The notes, of course, were never made.

The elimination of interpretative notations was naturally furthered by the Catholic reaction in England, but this same movement was destined to produce an opposite effect in a different quarter. For the Protestant refugees in Switzerland who produced the Geneva Version of 1557-1560 accompanied their text with a veritable running commentary in the margin, in which they did not hesitate to incorporate observations of a strongly controversial and polemical character. The king found his prerogatives endangered by such a note as that on Exod. 1:19 sanctioning the prevarication of the midwives before Pharaoh; and the pope would naturally object to being identified in Rev. 9:11 with the angel of the bottomless pit ("which is Antichrist the Pope, king of hypocrites & Satans ambassadour"), or to being described in II Pet. 2:3 as not "the successour of Simon Peter, but of Simon Magus."

An explanation of the why and wherefore of these notes is given in the preface of the Geneva New Testament, written supposedly by Calvin's brother-in-law, Whittingham, who is credited with the preparation of this edition. The varieties of notes which we have distinguished were all represented. With respect to the "annotations," as the interpretative *marginalia* are called, the following statement is made:

> . . . , I haue endeuored so to proffit all therby, that both the learned and others might be holpen: for to my knollage I haue omitted nothing vnexpounded, wherby he that is anything exercised in the Scriptures of God, might iustely complayn of hardenes: and also in respect of them that haue more proffited in the same I haue explicat all suche places by the best learned interpreters; as ether were falsely expounded by some or els absurdely applyed by others: so that by this meanes both they which haue not abilitie to by the Commentaries upon the Newe testament, and they also which haue not opportunitie and leasure to reade them because of their prolixitie may vse this booke in stede therof, and some tyme wher the place is not greatly harde, I haue noted with this marke ", that which may serue to the edification of the Reader: adding also suche commone places, as may cause him better to take hede to the doctrine.[11]

The title page of the Geneva Bible also informs one that the contents include "moste profitable annotations upon all the hard places." The modest assumption of the Genevan commentators that they had a special insight into the true meaning of the text is interestingly reflected in a part of the preface to the Bible of 1560, where, after excusing the imperfections of past translators on the grounds of "the infancie of those tymes and imperfect knollage of the tongues," the observation is made that "in respect of this ripe age and cleare light which God had now reveiled, the translations required greatly to be perused and reformed."

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 277.

As we have intimated, however, not everyone saw eye to eye with the reformers in their exegetical endeavors, so that their famous, or to some, infamous annotations provoked a considerable commotion in various places, and have even been considered as a contributory cause to the civil war between king and parliament. On the other hand, they apparently added greatly to the popularity of the version among the laymen. The church historian, Thomas Fuller, states that the people complained upon the disappearance of the Geneva Bible that "they could not see into the sense of the Scriptures for lack of the spectacles of those Genevan annotators." [12]

The strangest sequel of all, perhaps, lay in the fact that a good number of these very notes, some of course modified in form, were taken over into the authorized Bishops' Bible of 1568. This happened in spite of the attitude of Archbishop Parker, leader in the project, toward the Genevan commentary, as revealed in a letter addressed to Queen Elizabeth and complaining that "in certaine places be publikely vsed sum translations which have not byn Labored in your Realme having inspersed diverse preiudicall notis which might have ben also well spared." [13] It happened, also, notwithstanding that the "Observacions respected of the Translators" included the injunction: "Item to make no bitter notis vppon any text, or yet to set downe any determinacion in places of controversie." [14] In Galatians, for example, all but two of the twenty-two notes of the Bishops' Bible are from the Geneva Version, and in I Corinthians all but seven of the fifty *marginalia* are so derived. These include all of the kinds of notations which we have differentiated, those, however, of controversial tenor being naturally few. Yet the notes here temporarily come back into the authorized edition of the Bible, after all but the cross references had been dropped.

But the only form of the English Bible to rival the Geneva in the profuseness and the polemics of its *marginalia* was the Roman Catholic Rheims-Douai Version (N.T., 1582; O.T., 1609-1610). Its notes are frankly apologetic, obviously aimed at "heretics" in general and the Genevan annotators in particular. In explaining the necessity for a Catholic translation, Cardinal Allen referred to their function thus:

> . . . it is better that there should be a faithful and catholic translation than that men should use a corrupt version to their peril or destruction; the more so since the dangers which arise from reading certain more difficult passages may be obviated by suitable notes.[15]

The New Testament title page of this version described it as having

[12] Philip Schaff, *A Companion to the Greek Testament and the English Version* (New York, Harper; London, Macmillan, 1883), pp. 328-329.
[13] Pollard, *op. cit.*, p. 295.
[14] *Ibid.*, p. 297. [15] *Ibid.*, p. 300.

. . . Annotations and other necessarie helpes for the better understanding of the text, and specially for the discoverie of the corruptions of divers late translations, and for cleering the Controversies in Religion of these daies; . . .

The title page of the completed Bible contained a similar statement. The edition certainly made ample effort to fulfill the latter part of this program, for almost every other note seems to be directed at the "hereticks." The lengths to which apologetic motivations impelled translators and interpreters of the time may be gauged by an extraordinary remark included in the prefatory explanation of the reasons for Greek marginal notes. After indicating some laudable causes, such as, "Sometimes when the sense is hard, that the learned reader may consider of it and see if he can helpe him selfe better than by our translation . . . ," the N.T. Preface cites this as a reason: "Sometime for aduantage of the Catholike cause, when the Greeke maketh vs more than the Latin. . . ." [16] Many of the notes clearly have the Geneva group in view or are written in response to its biblical annotations. On Matt. 6:14 the first interpretation of "two masters" reads: "Two religions, God and Baal, Christ and Calvin, Masse and Communion. the Catholike Church and Heretical Conuenticles." Other remarks are more temperate. On Rev. 13 allusion is made to the Geneva note identifying the pope with antichrist and stating that although the number 666 could also be made to refer to Luther, "truely whatsoever the Protestants presume herein of the Pope, we may boldly discharge Luther of that dignitie. He is undoubtedly one of Antichrists precursors, but not Antichrist himself." With this charitable sentiment we return to the "authorized" Bible.

The King James edition of 1611 was the next official revision of the English Bible. The ecclesiastical authorities hoped that it might supplant the popular Geneva Version in a way that the Bishops' had failed to do, and eventually their hopes were fulfilled. Yet this new revision presented a strong contrast to the Genevan in respect to the nature of its *marginalia.* A report on the execution of the work, presented to the Synod of Dort, included these pertinent observations of restrictions to be placed upon notes:

> Secondly, no notes were to be placed in the margin, but only parallel passages to be noted.
>
> Thirdly, where a Hebrew or Greek word admits two meanings of a suitable kind, the one was to be expressed in the text, the other in the margin. The same to be done where a different reading was found in good copies.
>
> Fourthly, the more difficult Hebraisms and Græcisms were consigned to the margin.[17]

The translators, however, went somewhat beyond these instructions by incorporating some explanatory notations, and in the *Preface to the Reader*

[16] *Ibid.*, p. 311. [17] *Ibid.*, p. 339.

Miles Smith apparently felt it incumbent upon himself to vindicate these as well as the other notes. He therefore wrote as follows:

> Some peraduenture would haue no varietie of senses to be set in the margine, lest the authoritie of the Scriptures for deciding of controuersies by that shew of vncertaintie, should somewhat be shaken. But we hold their iudgme(n)t not to be so sound in this point. . . . it hath pleased God in diuine prouidence, heere and there to scatter wordes and sentences of that difficultie and doubtfulnesse, . . . that fearefulnesse would better beseeme vs then confidence, . . . Now in such a case, doth not a margine do well to admonish the Reader to seeke further, and not to conclude or dogmatize vpon this or that peremptorily? . . . Therefore as *S. Augustine* saith, that varietie of Translations is profitable for the finding out of the sense of the Scriptures: so diuersitie of signification and sense in the margine, where the text is not so cleare, must needes doe good, yea, is necessary, as we are perswaded. . . . They that are wise, had rather haue their iudgements at libertie in differences of readings, then to be captiuated to one, when it may be the other.

And so, besides some nine thousand cross references, over eight thousand marginal notes were devised for the 1611 editions. Of these about two thirds represented more literal renderings of the original text, and most of the remainder were alternative translations. Explanation of proper names, attempted harmonizations of the text, and textual variants account for about 250 each. Forty-two notes in the Apocrypha contained miscellaneous information, and in the New Testament there were thirty-five explanatory annotations, mostly concerned with coinage, measurements, and the like. Practically the only material extraneous to the text which was of exegetical nature was to be found in the running titles and chapter summaries, where in a few places like the Song of Solomon or Isaiah 53 the traditional interpretations were retained. Theological implications were reflected, however, in a great many of the citations of parallel or allegedly parallel passages. In subsequent editions the notations continued to increase in numbers, until by the time of the Blaney edition of 1769, which became the standard text, they had approximated 65,000, about half of which were cross references. Later reprintings even increased this number, and also incorporated a number of historical notes, of which the famous chronology of Archbishop Ussher was added in Lloyd's edition of 1701 from Ussher's *Annales Veteris et Novi Testamenti* (1650-1654).[18]

While the source of many of the original notes was the Bishops' Bible, which the revisers were supposed to follow closely, it was in reality a minor influence. Study of the notes has revealed a wide diversity of derivation, and in particular has indicated the special dependence upon the Tremellius and Junius Latin Old Testament, and the Greek and Latin texts of Beza

[18] Exact statistics are given by F. H. A. Scrivener, *The Cambridge Paragraph Bible of the Authorized English Version* . . . (3 vols., Cambridge, University Press, 1870-73), Introduction, Section II; or in Scrivener's reprinting of this data in *The Authorized Edition of the English Bible (1611)* . . . (Cambridge, University Press, 1884).

in the New Testament.[19] Practically all of the notes on variant readings in the New Testament are derived from the latter's text or annotations. While charges of theological bias are more difficult to substantiate in the text, there are a number of indubitable examples of such to be found in the marginal alternatives.

The continuing popularity of the Geneva Version is evidenced among other things by the fact that in 1649 and subsequently (1679, 1708, 1715) the King James text was printed in a quarto edition which included the Genevan marginal notes!

The Revised Version of 1881-1885 and its American counterpart of 1901 attempted—and with good success –to revise the notes, and, especially, to reintroduce some sense into the Scriptural cross references. These last were reduced to about one fifth of their former number, while alternative renderings and textual variants were increased in quantity, as might be expected in view of the tremendous amount of new textual, linguistic, and historical evidence which after the lapse of two and a half centuries could now be brought to bear upon the problems of translation.

The notes of the Revised Version fall into the same categories as those of the King James, and the American and British editions have about the same number in each group, the American having a somewhat larger quantity. On the other hand, the British company officially retained in revised form the chapter titles and headings while the American did not. Certain of the outstanding differences of opinion in controversial passages were incorporated in an appendix by the British revisers, and these were, of course, incorporated in the text of the American Revision.

The public attitude toward the Revision *marginalia* was apparently somewhat mixed. The general reaction may be gauged from the following estimate made by Philip Schaff, chairman of the American Committee:

> The first and the prevailing impression was one of disappointment and disapproval, especially in England. The expectations of the public were unreasonable and conflicting. Many were in hopes that the revision would supersede commentaries, and clear up all difficulties; instead of that, they found the same obscurities, and a perplexing number of marginal notes, raising as many questions of reading or rendering.[20]

To this may be added the observation that such as were acquainted with the problems involved soon discovered that the readings of the margin were often better than those of the text. The operation of the two-thirds majority vote on debatable passages had proved frequently efficacious in perpetuating traditional though inferior texts and translations.

[19] *Ibid.*, for examples in both text and margin.

[20] Schaff, *op. cit.*, p. 412.

In contrast to its immediate predecessor the Revised Standard New Testament published by a committee of American scholars in 1946 drastically reduced the number of marginal notes. Only 547 are given, of which 289 occur in the gospels. Of the total, forty-seven per cent are textual. The rest are distributed in what now appear to be standardized categories: alternative renderings, thirty-two per cent; more literal Greek, twenty per cent; explanations, five per cent. There is considerable change in the distribution, especially of the notes on text and on alternative translations. The citation of textual variants rises from about three per cent (KJ) to eighteen per cent (ASV) to fifty per cent (RSV) in the Synoptic gospels, which contain about half of all the notes. In the same books, on the other hand, citation of alternative renderings drops from about sixty-nine per cent (KJ) to forty-five per cent (ASV) to twenty-five per cent (RSV). The notation of more literal representations of the Greek also decreases considerably (from thirty-two per cent in ASV to twenty-one per cent in RSV).

Both of the main tendencies here observable were quite natural—as we have intimated—in view of progress made in New Testament study. The whole development of textual criticism, with its revelation of the enormous amount of evidence for the text and of variant readings, and with its displacement of the late, Byzantine text by one of the fourth century, took place subsequent to the publication of the King James Version. At the same time many obscurities in the meaning of the text have been cleared up by the great advance in knowledge of the Greek through study of the papyri and of the writers of hellenistic or *koine* Greek in the New Testament period. In addition, it is evident that the general reduction in notes in the Revised Standard Version is in keeping with its character as a semi-modern speech translation. As ambiguities and obscurities disappear when a version is couched in current, idiomatic, and intelligible speech, the need for marginal explanation naturally decreases. Many notes in the RSV are dropped also by virtue of the fact that the better marginal reading of the RV is incorporated in the text, and the alternative simply disregarded.

In spite of the progressive character of most of this change there are many places where the version may have gone too far in reducing the number of *marginalia*. At least, the basis for choosing passages for comment is not very apparent. While certain notes seem relatively unimportant, places of real difficulty are sometimes left without explanation, *e.g.*, in Mark 7:3 or I Cor. 7:21. Other inconsistencies also appear. For instance, in Matt. 2:1 the traditional rendering, "wise men," gives no indication of the real meaning of the original Greek or of the true profession (astrology) of the eastern visitants. But in Acts 13:6 and 8, where the same Greek is (legitimately enough) translated "magician," a footnote is given:

"Greek *magus* (as in Matthew 2.1)." Similarly, while the traditional Latin "publicans" for the Greek (*telōnai*) in Matt. 5:46 and elsewhere is replaced by the English "tax collectors," a transliteration like "mammon" is retained in the statement in Matt. 6:24, "You cannot serve God and mammon," without any explanation of the origin or meaning of the term.

It is of course impossible, short of an extended commentary, to do full justice to the meaning of the original documents. No one, for example, could adequately treat the word *logos* (John 1:1) in the margin. Yet the right of the reader to understand what he reads will doubtless make a certain number of explanatory *marginalia* necessary so long as portions of the text are rendered in an antiquated and often unintelligible idiom. But even in a translation into modern speech a convincing argument might be made especially for comment on passages where legitimate and important differences of interpretation still exist.[21] When such go unmarked it means that one opinion or viewpoint may be imposed upon the unsuspecting reader without his being aware of an alternative. As Miles Smith put it, he may "be captiuated to one, when it may be the other."

As an ideal toward which to move, the modern translator might well cite with sympathy and approbation a statement made by George Joye in his controversy with William Tyndale:

> But in good faithe as for me I had as lief put the trwthe in the text as in the margent. . . . I wolde the scripture were so purely and playnly translated that it neded nether note, glose nor scholia, so that the reder might once swimme without a corke.[22]

But so long as the going is still rough in spots, a certain amount of marginal explication may well serve to keep the reader's head above water.

[21] Except for Roman Catholic editions, the translation of R. F. Weymouth is the only well-known modern speech version supplied with notes in any extensive number.

[22] Pollard, *op. cit.*, pp. 194 f.

BELATED COMMENT

EDGAR SHEFFIELD BRIGHTMAN
Boston University

Some time ago I reviewed Dr. W. A. Shimer's book, *Conscious Clay,* for *Crozer Quarterly.* In a recent issue Dr. Shimer wrote a reply to my review.

Let me first explain that Dr. Shimer sent me a copy of his reply long before it appeared in print, with the request that I comment on it. However, circumstances beyond my control, including the excessive heat of the summer followed by a heart attack that incapacitated me for some time, prevented me from availing myself of his courtesy. Now, however, I am becoming "capacitated" again, and expect to return to the University for work the second semester. May I now make belated comment on Dr. Shimer's comment.

It is evident that my review did not represent the ideas that Dr. Shimer intended to convey in the book. However, the review did represent what the book conveyed to me. I thought that there was some inner contradiction in its thought. The title, it is true, suggests a sort of dualism (clay plus consciousness), which might well be called a realism; yet the same language is compatible with a panpsychistic idealism. When I read the last and summarizing sentence of Dr. Shimer's reply, I feel that my review has at least partial support. He says:

> Rather, I seem to see reality as a matrix of overlapping, interdependent, free persons and other things having their being in a democratic God, all consisting of creative patterns of the internal vital energy of the universe.

Obviously these words would not be used to describe my personalism. However, everything except the undefined phrase "and other things" is vaguely idealistic, I'd say; and "having their being in a democratic God" seems to me to be a "weasel" phrase which sucks the anti-idealism out of the "other things," and leaves us with the vague idealistic pantheism I surmised in my view.

Of course, I repeat, I accept Dr. Shimer's statement that he did not *intend* idealistic pantheism. But I feel justified in wishing that he had clarified his metaphysics so that a reader like myself would not have been misled. *Conscious Clay* is too good a book in its main content to suffer from an aura of vagueness. I sincerely hope that the vagueness is in my mind only, and that no one else was troubled by it.

Where Ignorance Is Bliss, 'Tis Folly

Some time ago I heard a distinguished minister stumble momentarily while leading his congregation in the Lord's Prayer. And, frankly, it did not disturb me in the least. Instead, I was rather glad. This is not to be construed as a sort of unseemly juvenile glee at the discomfiture of one's betters. We have been so casual and unthinking in our effortless repetition of these words that I fear that for most of us, most of the time, they have long since lost their cutting edge. It might well be a distinct blessing if their memory could be blotted from our minds and we were forced to learn them afresh. It could be that we would then be actually startled, at least a bit less casual, as we uttered them. For example, it would not hurt to be confronted with the stiff fact that instead of the somewhat easy, "as we *forgive*," the words really are "as we *have forgiven*." To often *that* cutting edge is dulled. Have we not infrequently forgiven others in the somewhat dim and misty past? Why surely we will take care of the present grudge too before long. But this uncomfortable and uncompromising word remains, and it seems somehow written in italics when we think of those other words regarding what is, what is not, the appropriate time for offering gifts upon the altar.

But there is another petition which for me never loses its braking power. I simply cannot slip by it casually. To many Christians it has seemed a strange request: "Lead us not into temptation." Its conclusion is easy: "but deliver us from evil." That sounds appropriate. That is what a good God would be expected to do. But how in sober reason can we conceive the One we have been taught to call "our Father" needing to be petitioned not to lead his children into temptation? Who of us would ever so treat his children? How then could God?

As a boy, I can remember an old lady who had long struggled with that verse. She was very sure that she believed that the Bible was in sober literalness the handiwork of God. Nonetheless she found this sentiment most perplexing. Had it been "guard" us or "shield" us from temptation, that would have been all right; but "lead us not into temptation"—that was clearly impossible. Finally she achieved a solution: she made a distinct pause after the first two words, "lead us," and then half-swallowed the offending "not into temptation" as she hastened on to the next clause. I was not even then satisfied with her exegesis, but I did and do applaud her wholesome theology at that point.

The difficulty lay for her—and I am sure that it does for many other thoughtful people—in the unfortuate use here of the word *temptation*. It

naturally conjures up a very clear and definite picture before our eyes. But the word so translated, perhaps not uninfluenced by the Latin *temtationem* in the Vulgate, does not properly mean "temptation" as we understand the word, although in some contexts it may and occasionally is so employed. Rather it signifies *trial, test,* or *proving;* more specifically, *the trial or testing of a man's fidelity, integrity, and virtue.* And a word which has long been either a source of perplexity or simply a meaningless bit of rote takes on a quite new significance.

Here is a petition which every one of us can utter daily with unqualified earnestness, and with no inserted commas or semicolons. Into the perennial debate as to whether America is or is not a Christian nation we fortunately need not enter at the moment. A man will not likely be thrown into jail or go to the scaffold or the flames if he sees fit to make this profession—nor yet to concentration camps.

But when this petition was first framed, such was not the case. Not infrequently that is precisely what he did face. And in times and places far nearer to our own favored land such a decision, such a stand, has involved a very real and certain menace. When we look back to what our forbears underwent, it is a singularly callous man who does not find in this word of old new meaning: "O God, do not, I pray thee, lead me to such a test as those of old underwent. Knowing my weakness, I fear I could not have stood firm. If it be possible, let it pass from me."

That is the prayer of all save fanatics. And in the unforgetable story of Gethsemane's garden is a picture which will not easily fade of one so praying. Surely it will be an unusual reader of these pages who will not find to hand many a circumstance which will give this ancient word, when so understood, new meaning. Nor need he fear that by so expressing it he is preventing himself from drinking without flinching the cup which so often does not pass away.

From Off the Campus and On

Once more we hope our readers will find material to their liking in this issue. We are told on what purports to be good authority that what is one man's meat is another man's poison. While we would not willingly include poison among our comestibles, we do try to follow the spirit, if not the letter, of the old saw, and hence seek to provide a fairly balanced ration of what we believe wholesome and tasty victuals. Nor is this difficult. Apparently people like to write for Crozer Quarterly. We have a good many articles on hand and the prospect of many more. Books are still cascading from the presses, and our reviewers are a singularly gracious

group of men who are always ready to help. So we hope you continue to like our product. There is no question but what we like your letters about it.

Dr. Pritchard is a familiar figure in these pages. Several of his articles have appeared, the last being "Too Many Cooks" (April, 1948) which we heartly recommend to our new readers who may have missed it. Dr. Pritchard is professor of Old Testament at Crozer, having come to the Seminary from the pastorate of a Methodist church. He is a graduate of Asbury College, Drew Theological Seminary, and the University of Pennsylvania. For several years he has been an associate editor of the *Journal of the American Oriental Society* and is at present reading proof of a volume of ancient texts illustrating the Old Testament.

Dr. Aubrey is head of the department of religious thought in the University of Pennsylvania, to which he was invited after several years as president of Crozer. All who make any attempt to keep abreast of theological thinking know and appreciate the insight and learning of this internationally acclaimed scholar.

Dr. Stevenson will be remembered by our readers for his essay, "Reformed Church Music," which appeared in CROZER QUARTERLY in January, 1949. He holds degrees from the University of Texas, Harvard, Yale, and Rochester. Formerly a member of the faculty of Westminster Choir College, he is now a visiting professor in the department of music at the University of California. His article should prove of interest to the general reader as well as to the Shakespearean expert.

Dr. Wells is assistant professor of philosophy at the State College of Washington, having gone there from Oregon State College. He did his undergraduate work at the University of Minnesota and at Hamline. He holds two degrees (S.T.B. and Ph.D.) from Boston University. It is a source of satisfaction to be able to print this pungent and provocative article, which will certainly be reread by many, not because it is obscure but because it is so clear.

Professor Wikgren is a home-grown product of the University of Chicago: A.B., A.M., Ph. D. After some years in the pastorate and on the faculties of Central Baptist Seminary and Ottawa University, he returned in 1941 to the University of Chicago, where he is now associate professor of New Testament and acting dean of the Baptist Divinity House. He is a member of the executive committee of the editorial board which is charged with the preparation of a new *apparatus criticus* of the New Testament. He has contributed many articles to learned journals and chapters to such coöperative volumes as *The Study of the Bible Today and Tomorrow*. He is coauthor of *Hellenistic Greek Texts* and coreviser of I. M. Price's *Ancestry of Our English Bible.*

To introduce Professor Brightman to readers of Crozer Quarterly would be utterly superfluous. His many articles and reviews are always eagerly received. In fact, it is not the editor's fault when an issue appears without the support of this able and distinguished Boston University professor of philosophy.

Thirty-two reviewers, forty-five books—while we double check these vital statistics, we always have a bit of dread lest some reader write in to point out in glee an error in lower mathematics. But since (*pace* Matt. 6:3, or is it I Chron. 21?) it is good advertising, we continue to count them as well as to name them with genuine gratitude. Mr. Ayres is head of the laboratories of the Gulf Research & Development Company. Dr. Berkeley is professor of Old Testament at Andover Newton. Professor Bond has the chair of religion at Bucknell. Dr. Brush is professor of church history at Andover Newton. Mr. Carpenter is director of the Wilmington (Del.) Institute Free Library. Dr. Dabney is dean of Andover Newton. Drs. Davis and Enslin are professors at Crozer—theology and New Testament. Mr. Theodore Enslin is a free-lance writer. Dr. Ferm is professor of philosophy at Wooster. Mr. Gehr is minister of the Church of the Restoration, Philadelphia. Dr. Grant is professor of New Testament at Union. Professor Hallowell is a member of the department of social science at Duke. Dr. Hamilton is professor of philosophy of religion and Christian missions at Oberlin. Dr. Harkness is professor of church history at Crozer. Dr. Hershey is minister of the Church of the Holy Communion, Philadelphia. Mr. Hiltner is head of the Commission on Health and Religion for the Federal Council. Professor Horton has the chair of theology at Oberlin. Dr. Hubben is editor of the *Friends Intelligencer*. Dr. Ivey is minister of the Second Baptist Church, Richmond. Professor Keighton has the chair of homiletics and public worship at Crozer. Dr. King is associate professor of philosophy and religion at Grinnell. Mr. Luttrell is minister of the Main Street Baptist Church, Emporia, Va. Dr. Mather is professor of geology at Harvard. Dr. Matthews is professor *emeritus* of Old Testament at Crozer. Dr. McCracken is professor of classics at Drake. Dr. Moehlman is professor *emeritus* of church history at Colgate-Rochester. Mr. Pittenger is professor of theology at General Theological Seminary. Mr. Rose is associate minister of the Baptist Temple, Charleston, W. Va. Dr. Smith, a retired Baptist minister, has just completed a term of service as interim administrator at Crozer. Dr. Widgery is professor of philosophy at Duke. Dr. Wright is professor *emeritus* of philosophy at Dartmouth.

BOOK REVIEWS

Addressed to Christians: Isolationism vs. World Community, by Floyd H. Ross, New York, Harper, ©1949, pp. 154, $2.

At long last, at very long last, we are finally getting a book which is of the kind that is sorely needed today for Christian thinking. This is a sympathetic treatment of essential Christianity and at the same time a point of view desperately aware of our new one world into which the mid-twentieth century has moved. Congratulations are in order not only to its author (professor at the University of Southern California) but to the editor of the publishing firm for daring to come out for a book (with a money-return if buyer is not stimulated, guaranteed on the jacket) written for the church with a really fresh look at things. All in all, it is directed at the inadequacies of centuries of Christian tradition and particularly toward the unrealistic thinking which has come out of postwar German theology and more particularly toward American theologians who have sold out to some form of ecclesiasticism in theology.

Ross approaches his theme of world community by way of a mature knowledge of the history of Christian doctrines and by way of a more-than-casual awareness of the claims of other great world religions now pressing for their fair share of recognition even by Occidentals. He writes in an irenic spirit, but the whole approach is dynamite to traditionalism.

The task of the theologian he (rightfully) affirms is primarily exploratory. For a generation now we have been getting "final" answers, *the* Christian answer, in a host of books by neoörthodox, semiorthodox, quasi-orthodox, and plain orthodox. It's the same old story—with only the characters changed. By orthodoxy is meant: not too far removed from Paul, Augustine, Luther, Calvin—and (what I would like to call) the Protestant Mississippi. It is a sign of real depth, says the author, in any field to see significant levels of relations, to depart from traditional hypotheses where these no longer serve. The great new significant set of relations is world community; and contemporary theologians in the saddle do not have the depth to see the need for a reformation of Christian theology on a grand scale. Contemporary liberalism in the orthodox framework has been (thus far) blind to the fact that real ecumenicity in religion needs something beyond ecclesiastical ecumenicity of a halfway order (partisan Protestantism). A world community now cries for an appropriate theology. (Amen!) The theology in the churches is framed in hypotheses and premises which must be questioned down to their very base. What premises? Such, for example, as that which holds that the Christian religion is *the* one revealed way to God and *the* religion of election (in favor with God). Such, for example, as that which swears by anything Paul ever said or inferred or premised. The Pauline divided-self theology (so also Augustine and Luther) is fine for such as he—but are we all such as he or must we become such as he? Such, for example, as the absolutisms and dogmatism of confessional theologies. Such, for example, as that subtle Israelitic premise that God's elected way came only via Palestine and the Roman church, and through it by way of a Luther or Calvin, still Catholic in premise.

What we now need is a world parliament of religions, says the author. This will not be a warmed-over Protestant ecumenical movement in the hands of hopelessly conservative dogmaticians whose feet still wade the old stream. No more of this

special "chosenness" doctrine in the one world. It will not be stomached, for it lacks the truth of open experience. We are still too far ignorant of others in God's households. There are other high spots in Christian history besides those of Paul and Augustine and Luther and Calvin. Origen and Clement and the Alexandrians had something of the catholicity that needs reëxploring (even though they were sons of their times). We must again become seekers (Quakers will love this—that is, if they have not forgotten the spirit which prompted their movement). There are far too many disciples—simple learners of those who lead blindly. On any other terms a world community cannot and will not be built. (Amen!)

The author suggests that we must look to the founder of the faith as one who had both universal and provincial insights. And he observes: what a tragedy that Paul's letters became altogether canonized. Not that they were not great writing and of high religious quality. But rather, because they were preëminently personal testimonies rather than altogether universal and normative.

The chapter titles to this book suggest the historical approach to the treatment: beginnings of the Christian community (sectarianism with Peter; but broad in principles, particularly in the parables of Jesus); the enlarging community and the narrow horizon (the Israelitic election theory taken over by the Christians and *constricting* the idea of a wider community); the creed defined, with any dissent from it heresy; the church made safe; the hesitant reformers (not reforming enough and ignorant of other great religions); cautious advance (with people like Professor J. B. Pratt, late of Williams College, showing vision, but with most liberal Christians still committed to the backyards of Christian tradition); and, finally, the religious principle and world community (a philosophy of values to be fashioned, wherever values are found in whatever cultural climate; a philosophy of seeking; a flight away from absolutisms of whatever form; and a disclaimer of the idea of salvation as a kind of copyright by some theological theory or by some church).

If ministers would like to have their minds stretched—to think some new thoughts relevant to our day—this is the book! In the language of the GI's: this author has his tickets! It is a thoroughly prophetic book. VERGILIUS FERM

A Philosophy of Life, by Richard N. Bender, New York, Philosophical Library, ©1949, pp. xi, 250, $3.75.

Had this review a title, it would be: "Philosophy for Everyman." For the avowed purpose of the author is to make the way of wisdom so plain that "the wayfaring men, yea fools, shall not err therein"—*fools* in this case being the unphilosophical people who find a "definite need that life shall 'add up' to something worthwhile." It is to aid those, whether men in the streets or college freshmen, who realize the necessity of a philosophy of life but are dismayed as much by a glimpse of the fierce-eyed specialist who roams the philosophical jungle and by the sound of his jargon-ridden conflict with his fellow denizen (*i.e.*, colleague), as by the magnitude of the problems life poses. Hence Professor Bender seeks to rescue philosophy from its obscure moments and cloistered specialization and bring it into the highways of common thought, outfitted in overalls rather than academic robes.

To an encouraging extent he succeeds. His easygoing approach will not frighten the laymen away in the first ten pages. He feeds his philosophical terminology into the victim sparingly and painlessly. He actually prefers a simple word when a more difficult one would easily do half as well. (What a marvel among authors!) The material is organized directly and simply about such basic questions as: how much of truth we can know, the nature of the universe and ourselves, the evidence for

and against free will, God, and immortality, how good is to be defined as against moral evil. These are basic concerns for everyday living, and as far as possible the differing views and main issues are stripped to fundamentals. The structure is coherent, following a pattern of development but not so closely woven that one frayed strand unravels the whole or one misunderstood section renders the rest incomprehensible. It is thoroughly subdivided, with compact summaries and questions concluding each chapter.

My questions about the book are three. One regards the author's underlying system of philosophy. Openmindedly he does not propose to defend any "particular school of thought" (p. x), but this does not mean that his open mind is an empty one. I find strong traces of liberal rationalistic Protestantism, such as: "Right living is reasonable living. Immorality is avoidable irrationality in a rational universe" (p. 189); and: "It is to be observed that the principle of the mean is quite consistent with the emphasis upon the spirit and intent of morality found so prominently in the teachings of Jesus and Socrates" (p. 182). Mild socialism makes its bow here: "In the so-called Christian world where we have regarded the personal profit motive as the only one sufficient to assure production, we have a fundamental philosophical problem which . . . will block the development of any satisfactory economic system" (p. 199). And there is throughout a quality of eclecticism which takes a little Greek philosophy, some Christian and Hebrew morality, and some assorted contemporary insights with (to me) no clearly definable philosophical basis, and adds them up to some surprisingly orthodox Christian conclusions.

My second question has to do with the author's treatment of some crucial philosophical and religious problems. I often agree with his conclusions but think he arrives at them a bit too smoothly. In a moment, which being interpreted means a page or two, we are conducted from despair into hope, from death to life, and all with a conjurer's offhand ease. (Has his effort at making philosophy easy betrayed him here?)

For example, the case for determinism could be more strongly stated; the evidence for immortality, admittedly circumstantial or presumptive, seems a little lighter than the opposing arguments, and does not quite turn their edge. Also it seems too easily true that: "But for the same reasons that there can be no contradictions between universal and individual values, there can be no contradictions between universal and individual rules of morality" (p. 189). That very contradiction is often practical morality's sorest problem! And is it not too facile to ask: "Why should verification of the claims to experiencing the presence of God pose any more complicated problems" (p. 144) than verifying a man's love of his mother by observation of his writing letters, sending presents, etc.? Obviously the verification needed is not of the genuineness of some sort of *experience,* but of the *object* of that experience. And that is different and harder in the case of God. Is not the definition of moral rightness as "intent to conserve or increase values" (p. 188) both too wide and too narrow? It is illustrated by the wrongness of the boy who first learns to drink in college (too narrow) and thereafter is left rather vaguely afloat in the field of personal values (too wide). And why is the existence of the communistic ethic scarcely mentioned while the author vigorously condemns fascism's "ethics of power"?

The third difficulty I find is trying to decide for whom the book was really written: philosophy students or just people. The life story of the twins, ambitious Tom and lazy Tim, (pp. 81-84) comes straight out of philosophy's primer; but it is used to illustrate "A Coherent Interpretation of the Question of Determinism

Versus Free Will." Edgar Guest, at his corniest, and for nearly two thirds of a page, helps distinguish right from wrong—a bid for the man in the street; but the chapter summaries and the "Axiological Vocabulary" in the appendix are couched in respectable if simple philosophical language—for the philosophy student. And the style of the book throughout suffers somewhat from this division in the author's heart, being unevenly light and serious, diffuse and compact, oversimple and technical.

But after saying all this one must also say: Would that there were more such works emanating from philosophers! It is refreshing to find someone at least *trying* to bring philosophical illumination forth from the studies of the learned doctors into common language and bearing on daily life. Professor Bender's failures spring mostly from the difficulty of the task he has chosen to undertake.

WINSTON L. KING

Christianity and Civilisation: Specific Problems, by Emil Brunner, New York, Scribner, 1949, pp. ix, 147, $2.50.

The second volume of Brunner's Gifford Lectures enhances the impression made by the first, of a strange new simplicity and lucid wisdom, unexpected in one who has written so much that is profound but ponderous and polemical. Perhaps it is Brunner's hope for a revival of intelligent lay Christianity that speaks here. Laymen will certainly read it, for all their chief interests are passed in review: technics and science, education and art, work and wealth, law and government.

Upon all these subjects, Brunner comes to somewhat similar conclusions: the legitimacy of each secular concern; the necessity of thinking through the proper place of each such concern in the Christian scheme of things; the danger, under modern conditions, of a secularized perversion of science, art, etc., acknowledging no responsibility to God or man for its proper exercise, and leading to destructive consequences; the possibility of overcoming these destructive consequences through a return to basic Christian teachings.

In the case of technics, the secularist perversion consists in turning mere means into ends in themselves. In the case of science, secularism leads to an impossible attempt to exclude all religious or metaphysical presuppositions; in education, to the notion of mere "adaptation to the social environment"; in art, to an æstheticism in which artistic perfection takes the place of moral perfection; in economics, to exploitation of personality and loss of the sense of responsible vocation; in politics, to the absolute maximum of accumulated power" in the totalitarian state, which Brunner calls "the Satanic incarnation of our time" (p. 121). Great as are these dangers, helpless as the church is to combat them without a great rebirth of cultural concern, Brunner sees hope in the fact that in every realm a spontaneous revolt has occurred against the excesses of secularism, and the Christian mind has become actively engaged again with the problems of culture and civilization. These are not the *final* problems, for the Christian: but paradoxically, the secularism which concerns itself only with this world cannot adequately face this world's problems; while Christianity's vision of a destiny beyond this world enables it to tackle these problems with a "faith and hope which have their roots as well as their aim beyond history" (p. 143).

Brunner's lectures may be taken as important evidence that Continental theologians, who used to be very severe in their judgment of American "activism," have at last found theological grounds for considering the tasks of civilization as part of their Christian duty. It is good that this is so, for Christian civilization in Europe has become deeply corrupt, and needs to be reformed "in head and members."

WALTER M. HORTON

The Conservation of Freedom, by Robert L. LaMott, New York, Exposition Press, ©1949, pp. 145, $3.

The way of life known as communism is increasingly set over against the way of life we call democracy in an irreconcilable conflict. Robert L. LaMott, minister of Trinity Church, Tacoma, Washington, writes his book, *The Conservation of Freedom,* from this point of view. He is not content, however, with the term *democracy,* for he sees this struggle in much more than its political aspects. It is a conflict which goes to the very roots of our culture and challenges the religious foundations of our Christian world. For him *freedom* is a more descriptive term and much more inclusive of the values we cherish. The discussion of freedom under violent attack by totalitarianism gives the author opportunity and reason to review the essentials of the Christian faith in order to rediscover the foundations upon which our culture is based. This is too often forgotten, or neglected, or set aside as though it did not matter. "The social system known as Freedom faces the possibility of drastic modification and even extinction," writes the author in the preface. He believes that Christian men need to recognize this fact, understand its implications, and rededicate themselves to a vital religious faith in order to avert such a threatened calamity.

Freedom and the love of it have been our priceless heritage in the Judæo-Christian culture for many centuries. In the light of the current attack upon it, however, we have tended to lose sight of this heritage of freedom and to become obsessed by another search, the search for security, which has become the "dominant motive of our century." Totalitarianism promises to all men a social and economic security. While it is a false promise, it does make a great appeal to men who have been exploited or who live in a difficult or hazardous economy. The attacks of totalitarianism upon our way of life have been so ruthless and so successful that many have begun to doubt the adequacy of freedom as a philosophy of life. We are much too willing to sacrifice the freedom we have for a security which promises much and achieves only a new kind of slavery. Here lies the explanation of a "decline of faith" and here is the rallying cry to a new struggle to preserve this greatest of all our cultural values, freedom. The call to the conservation of freedom is the call of God to Christian men to save much more than a form of government. It is the commission to rebuild a faith in Christian values and to remake the world on the pattern of Christ's ideal expressed in the kingdom of God.

This recognition of threat and problem and purpose sends Dr. LaMott to the task of reëxamining what freedom means in many phases of our life and thought. Freedom is impossible without truth in every aspect of individual and social life, for God is truth. Any attempt to deny or to manipulate truth is a form of atheism which never makes a man free, but only enslaves him. Totalitarianism is an irresponsible use of power. Freedom is always the responsible use of power. Those who wield power must always accept responsibility for the good of their fellows and the service of God.

In reading this book it is necessary always to keep in mind the basic problem or one is apt to fall into the error of supposing that here is a series of essays on the Christian way of living, only more or less related to each other. What the author does is to interpret the spirit of Protestantism, the nature of the kingdom of God, the Christian way of life, worship, education, the problem of man, and other relevant topics in the light of his earlier statement of the conflict between freedom and totalitarianism. In all these phases of his life and heritage, the Christian man will find forgotten or undiscovered resources of insight and power to direct and support him in his fight for freedom. This is indeed a spiritual rebirth and a rededication to God and the doing of his will.

Men are called to freedom. Certainly, Christians are called to freedom. Freedom is God at work in the world, and men are challenged in all humility and devotion to dedicate their lives and their powers to God in his great purposes. But the victory is not inevitable, it is only possible. There is no determinism in freedom. But freedom is possible for men of intelligence and good will. They must give themselves to the conservation of freedom if they want to serve God in any significant way.

Some carelessness in editing the book is noticeable. On p. 88 a reference is made to the Epistle of Jude where the Epistle of James is intended. On that same page, Jesus is inaccurately quoted. On p. 112 there is a word probably intended to be *uncnding,* but which is spelled quite differently. These are evidences of carelessness rather than error but they stand out sharply in an otherwise very stimulating and attractively printed book.

CHARLES M. BOND

Early American Methodism: 1769-1844 (Part I), by Wade Crawford Barclay, New York, Board of Missions and Church Extension of the Methodist Church, 1949, pp. xli, 449, $3.50.

The missionary motive and genius of Christianity have always been central and insistent throughout its history. "Go Ye" has been its marching orders from primitive days, and many have been the loyal souls who have obeyed implicity the command. In that multitude no greater heroism and effective service to the cause has been manifest than by those who carried the gospel to the new land of America.

In the latter half of the eighteenth century came missionaries from England to the Atlantic seaboard, and of these many are to be numbered among the most courageous, sacrificial, and effective in all the history of the Christian church. Appointees of John Wesley, they came to the New World to proclaim a more evangelical doctrine, principle, and practice of the Anglican Church than had hitherto prevailed. Such men as Francis Asbury did not consider their own advantage as they traveled weary miles throughout the old colonies and the newly formed states.

Dr. Barclay has told that story well—the hope and plan of Wesley, his iron will and discipline, his conception of the societies, the establishment of the American Methodist Episcopal Church, its rapid growth and marvelous expansion to the enlarging frontiers. No one would seek to rob, or could rob, those early circuit riders of the credit and honor due them in the molding of America's religious life. Great preachers they were, ceaseless and untiring in their efforts and creative in their efficient organizing achievements. But one could have wished for less fulsome praise and unblushing adulation in this first volume of the projected six in a *History of Methodist Missions.* A true historian of necessity must develop a critical mind and an unbiased, impartial approach to his subject.

These missionaries, worthy as they were, it is well to remember, arriving in the late decades of the eighteenth century, came to an America well established in culture and civilization, nearly 150 years after others had come to a wilderness untamed by the hand of man. Jesuits were there and so were Anglicans, Presbyterians, Puritans, and Dutch Reformed. One is reminded of the taunt of Governor William Bradford of the Pilgrim Fathers, who landed on the rock at Plymouth in 1620, levelled at the proud and haughty theocrats of Boston, settling there a decade later: "That with their (Pilgrim) miseries they opened a way to these new lands and after these storms with what ease other men came to inhabit in them, in respect of the calamities these men suffered; so as they seem to go to a bride's feast where all things are provided for them."

Dr. Barclay seems to be as unmindful of such historical and significant facts as

were the Lord's Brethren of the Bay Colony. Nor does he give sufficient credit to the laborers in the vineyard immediately preceding the coming of the Wesleyan missionaries. On p. 1 appears this particularly astonishing statement: "If Wesley had deliberately set himself to choose an inopportune time for planting Methodism in the New World, he could not have done better than to fix upon the years immediately preceding the Revolution. Religion was in the trough of the wave of reaction following the Great Awakening of the middle decades of the century." That is, the more deplorable conditions can be made, the more glory to the evangelists for the success of their efforts!

But the fact is the time was ripe for such a movement. The Revolution—though not the War—was on, from 1763 at least, and it was this revolution, this new Americanism in revolt, that made the sowing and reaping of the Wesleyan form of Anglicanism possible. The ground had been made fallow by long years of evangelical preaching in the Great Awakening which had not yet ceased its beneficent work. George Whitefield did not die until 1770, and that death occurred in Newburyport, Massachusetts.

Though mention is made (pp. 59 f.) of the extraordinarily successful revival activities in Virginia in the 1770's of Devereaux Jarratt (an evangelical who, however, never withdrew from the Anglican communion), the author finds it necessary, or wise, to say: "Effective as Jarratt's ministry was, it is generally agreed that the chief instrument in the Virginia Awakening during the year 1775-76 was George Shadford, appointed senior preacher on the Brunswick Circuit in May of that year." Yet Jarratt had begun his work as early as 1765, and his influence was felt through all the counties of the colony.

Again, laudatory attention is paid to the missionary spirit of this early Methodism as though it were peculiar to that group. "At the Christmas Conference, 1784, Freeborn Garrettson and James O. Cromwell 'were set apart especially for Nova Scotia' and Jeremiah Lambert 'was ordained for the island of Antigua, in the West Indies.' This action has never had the attention in the history and literature of the Church that its importance deserves." Why so? Is there some peculiar significance attached to those words "set apart" and "ordained"? What of Eliot, Brainerd, Jonathan Edwards, and others, when the settlements were much more raw and primitive? Quite rightly Dr. Barclay remarks: "Asbury himself did not dwell upon it. In the laconic manner characteristic of his *Journal* he merely remarked: 'Twelve elders were elected, and solemnly set apart to serve our societies in the United States, one for Antigua, and two for Nova Scotia.'"

Why should Asbury give it special attention? True, Nova Scotia was "outside the bounds of the United States," as the author says, but did this make these men the "first foreign missionaries of American Methodism"? Wesley had sent his missionaries to the New World, to America; and Nova Scotia was within those bounds. Neither Wesley nor Asbury nor any other member of the Conference made the distinction which Dr. Barclay seeks to make. There was no more significance and no more heroism attached to the "setting apart" of men for Nova Scotia and Antigua than there was in commissioning others for Georgia or Tennessee. The record itself proves that. West of the Alleghanies was as foreign a territory as were the eastern provinces of British America and much more dangerous.

Apart from these and some other similar objectionable features and weaknesses, we have in this first volume of the *History of Methodist Missions* a most valuable collection of facts, inspirational in their revelation of the courage and faith of simple, ordinary men who were determined to conquer this new-born nation for

their Christ. And the telling of that story also reveals a long period of intensive research and the collection and organization of an immense amount of material.

R. E. E. HARKNESS

The Pattern of the Past, by Pieter Geyl, Arnold J. Toynbee and Pitirim Sorokin, Boston, Beacon, 1949, pp. 130, $2.

It is not surprising that Christian ministers, and those who write books and articles to aid them in their thinking and preaching, have quite generally welcomed with hearty approval the ideas expressed by Arnold Toynbee in recent years. Those ideas come as a refreshing antidote to the pessimism of Spengler whose star was similarly in the ascendancy only a few years ago. They seem to be the result of a scientific approach to the age-old problem of discovering the meaning of human history, a problem with which every thoughtful person must come to grips sooner or later, and which has peculiar significance for every Christian.

Not only is the Toynbee philosophy approved because it is "scientific," but also because it contains so many elements that harmonize with important aspects of Christian doctrine. Toynbee's outlook is the reverse of historical materialism and therefore in commendable opposition to the Marxist dialectic that presents so formidable a challenge to Christendom in these days of our lives. In his view, "the process of civilization is one of vanquishing the material problems to grapple with the spiritual ones." He, too, is a believer in free will, "in man's freedom to respond with all his heart and soul and mind when life presents him with a challenge."

In this slender volume, however, Professor Toynbee's interpretation of history is sharply criticized by Dr. Geyl and Professor Sorokin, who independently marshal much evidence to indicate "that Toynbee's uniformities of growth and decline of the civilizations are largely fantastic and are not borne out by the facts." Significantly enough, the criticism of these able scholars is directed not against those aspects of the Toynbee philosophy, cited in the preceding paragraph, but against the specific inferences drawn from supposedly scientific analysis of historical events. Actually the three writers display a large measure of agreement concerning the nature of the forces revealing themselves in human history. It is the appearance of rigidity and determinism, if not indeed of fatalism, in Toynbee's "uniformities" that has aroused their antagonism.

The book consists of a translation by Dr. Geyl of a lecture that he delivered at Utrecht in 1946, a discussion between Dr. Geyl and Professor Toynbee, broadcast by the BBC in 1948, and an essay by Professor Sorokin published originally in 1940. It is good reading matter for every student of religion, not only because it is an excellent example of the application of scientific methods to the analysis of the life of man, but also because its conclusions undergird some very fundamental principles of Christianity.

KIRTLEY F. MATHER

The Drama of Ancient Israel, by John W. Flight with Sophia L. Fahs, Boston, Beacon, 1949, pp. xv, 201, $2.75 (with a 47-page *Guide for Teacher,* by Elsie M. Bush).

This very presentable book is one in the *Beacon Series in Religious Education.* It is intended for use by young people of junior and senior high school age. The story of the making of the nation of Israel is its topic; the period from the fall of Jericho to the division of the kingdom is covered. The book is attractively printed and bound, as finely as the best books pupils use in public school. The illustrations are well chosen and add greatly to the attractiveness of the book and the understanding of

the text. The author has gone directly to the rich and indispensable archæological resources, especially in the story of Jericho. This included a visit to the excavations at Jericho and an interview with Garstang, the excavator of this renowned city. The volume is strong in this feature. More and better maps designed for the different episodes would improve the book.

As the story is traced through the great events, fictionalized conversation is employed to attract and hold interest. This method is not always successful. The dialogue often lacks the dynamic qualities of the Bible text and becomes rather matter-of-fact. It is poorly done in the conversation of the Hebrews before crossing the Jordan. Such substitutes for the Bible text tend to become modernizations of dialogue which lose the character and point of the original. The book could be made stronger by more use of great words from the text which has demonstrated its enduring inspiration. The imaginative reproduction of a scene is done best in the case of David playing before Saul.

"The story as we tell it in this book is different in a number of important ways from the story as told in the Bible. The reason for this is that we have tried to recover, as far as possible, what really happened in those far-off days" (p. xiii). This indicates the method which must be used with the aid of archæology. But this does not justify every theoretical restatement of the order of events. The rule of the game in this procedure is to distinguish between what we find as fact and what we advance as theory from our point of view. This is not clearly done in this volume. All the facts of the invasion are not clearly established as yet and that should be recognized. The author's reconstruction should not be set down as fact.

This volume is not strong in presenting the faith of Israel, the dynamic motivation which is at the core of this story. But it is this faith which gives the drama its eternal significance. No pupil reading this book will find his own life confronted by obligation, inspiration, decision. The story is strong in its character of secular history and will help to this kind of understanding. But it does not awaken awareness of God at work confronting man in his political and economic life.

The *Guide for Teachers* is a very useful aid. In it Miss Bush reports suggestions developed in the use of these lessons by teachers in the Faith Congregational Church, Springfield, Massachusetts. This will be welcomed by any teacher who uses this book. But care must be taken in its use. In the dramatization of Solomon as the close of these aids, that tyrannical ruler receives a whitewashing which does not accord with the "new Bible" of historical study nor with Jesus' estimate of Solomon's glory.

This book is recommended to teachers who are eager and willing to engage in serious study. But let them add to it *Israel in Canaan* by Jacob S. Golut (Union of American Hebrew Congregations, 1930) and *Eyes of Faith* by Paul Minear. It so happened that this reviewer read the same day chap. 4 of this book and chap. 2 of Martin Buber's *The Prophetic Faith*. Both deal with Deborah's song, that ancient ballad of Israel. The first treatment covers the surface with illuminating information. Buber deals with the profound religious realities.

The care with which this book has been prepared, its attractive form and superior production, set for all workers in Christian education a model of what is most desirable.

J. P. BERKELEY

World Faith, by Ruth Cranston, New York, Harper, ©1949, pp, xii, 193, $3.

The task of building friendship in a world society demands a revision of the classic approach to the study of non-Christian religions which has been for too long a time one of a benevolent but nevertheless condescending appraisal of oriental tra-

ditions. Frequently the conventional treatment of other faiths has also attempted an almost esoteric scientific level that made them either inaccessible to the average reader or, at least, uninviting. The present study is meant to be a popular presentation and is, as such, a most attractive and enlightening first book for anyone attempting to feel his way into oriental religious thought.

The religions described and analyzed are Hinduism, Buddhism, Confucianism, Taoism, Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. A final chapter attempts to evaluate the best in all these religions and their basic similarities.

The author has a felicitous manner of blending an objective historical account and the descriptive treatment of existing beliefs, practices, and rituals with observations from their locale. Frequently she inserts a quotation from the gospel or a reminder of Christian practices and thinking at a fitting place suggesting comparisons of a neighborly or critical nature and a balanced evaluation of foreign ways. Her sympathetic approach to a world entirely different from our own traditions gives the reader the ever-present feeling of being guided by a wise and friendly teacher who has not only taught and lived in the Orient for a considerable period of time but has also used her later contacts with Orientals in Europe and America to clarify and supplement impressions gained in the milieu of these religions. Much of the material is narrative, and the analytical presentations are concise and convincing. The recurrent emphasis upon the burden of cultural and national situations which may have given a bias to our judgment is truly enlightening. It separates the accidental circumstances of time, place, and a backward level of civilizations from the essence of religious faith. The Hindu explanation of idols and the brief paragraph on polygamy in the Moslem world are illustrations of this sober and helpful approach. Ruth Cranston is not only familiar with the pure and original teachings of oriental prophets and the less orthodox practices as they have developed but also with our many prejudices and wrong clichés of thinking. Her chapter on the Buddhist Nirvana is a case in point. Her brief treatment of Christianity is concise and will be as informative to non-Christians as her other chapters are to Christians. The final chapter extracts the common values from the earlier material and reveals surprising similarities in all faiths: the laws of civilization are also the laws of all religions.

Apart from its value as a source of information, the book will also help to stem the tide of a religious relativism that is gaining ground. The reader will realize that the same, or similar, values are basic wherever man turns to God and that the recourse of our skeptics to the popular argument that environment and superstitions are fundamental conditions for religions everywhere can hardly touch the surface of the living truth as it exists in all religions.

This is an excellent and most helpful book.

WILLIAM HUBBEN

Scientific Autobiography and Other Papers, by Max Planck, New York, Philosophical Library, ©1949, pp. 192, $3.75.

Some of the chapters of this book make rewarding reading for the scientific layman, in spite of their occasional content of difficult technology. The translation is excellently done, and Planck's mode of expression is simple and clear. This is all the more remarkable in that the writing was done when Planck was about eighty years old. He had lost none of his capacity for the lucid thinking that had made him one of the greatest physicists of all time. He developed the quantum theory, which did for the physics of the atom what Einstein's relativity theory did for the physics of the universe. The two men were alike in that they distrusted current impressions of reality and preferred to reason from unconventional assumptions.

They were both possessed of an "artistically creative imagination," which led them to the "presuppositions" without which there can be no scientific progress.

One of the most interesting chapters is the discussion of "phantom problems" which cannot be solved—either because there exists no indisputable method to unravel them, or because considered in the cold light of reason they turn out to be absolutely devoid of all meaning. Many of the phantom problems are capable of yielding diametrically opposite answers depending upon the viewpoint. "The question, whether the electron is in reality a particle, occupying a certain position in space at a certain time, or a wave, filling all of infinite space," can be answered either way depending upon the method of studying the electron's behavior. There can be no absolute answer. In the same way, the freedom of the will can be demonstrated if we observe from within, while the will appears to be causally determined if we observe from without. Planck shows that the law of causality in physics is neither true nor false. He calls attention to the difficulties that have arisen by confusing the scientific viewpoint with the religious viewpoint. For example, it is sometimes erroneously assumed that consciousness of moral freedom is incompatible with the law of causality. "The repeated efforts to establish scientific grounds for the existence and personality of God stand on the same level."

Planck was a deeply religious man and in his essay, "Religion and Natural Science," he concludes that "no matter where and how far we look, nowhere do we find a contradiction between religion and natural science." He identifies a "rational world order" of science with the God of religion, which seems to this reviewer to be unnecessary. He is on firm ground, however, when he says that "religion and natural science are fighting a joint battle in an incessant, never relaxing, crusade against scepticism and against dogmatism, against disbelief and against superstition. . . ."

One of the best chapters is "The Meaning and Limits of Exact Science." He demonstrates that while we must postulate a *real world* we can never fully comprehend its nature, and, for this reason, the "proud name, 'Exact Science,' must not be permitted to cause anybody to underestimate the significance of this element of irrationality." He concludes with these eloquent words: ". . . he whom good fortune has permitted to coöperate in the erection of the edifice of exact science will find his satisfaction and inner happiness, with our great poet Goethe, in the knowledge that he has explored the explorable and quietly venerates the unexplorable."

EUGENE AYRES

Philosophy of Nature, by Moritz Schlick, New York, Philosophical Library, ©1949, pp. xi, 136, $3.

Thirteen years ago, when Moritz Schlick, an eminent professor of philosophy at the University of Vienna, was about to deliver his concluding lecture in a course upon the philosophy of physics, he was fatally shot by a lunatic. Two of his pupils have edited and published the manuscript upon which these lectures were based, together with a few extracts from his other writings which throw additional light upon the topics treated. The book is a concise popular summary of some recent developments in astronomy and mathematical physics. The editors call attention to the few points on which they say different opinions now prevail among scientists.

Schlick a generation ago would have been classified as a mechanistic materialist and an extreme reductionist. Perhaps these terms are now outmoded. However, he regards all the phenomena and processes of the physical universe as at least theoreti-

cally reducible to mathematical physics. He recognizes nothing like new levels of emergent evolution or teleological interpretations of any kind.

For Schlick, the space of the universe is finite but unbounded, in accordance with Einstein's theory of general relativity. The universe is expanding so rapidly that in 1,300 million years all distances in it will be doubled. The world exists in four dimensions, time of course being the fourth dimension. "The world does not consist of substance, but of a system of ordered events or occurences." The words *cause* and *effect* do not occur in the laws of nature, but instead "the interconnection of events expressed by mathematical functions." The fact that neither the corpuscular nor the wave conceptions can be used exclusively, illustrates the essential impossibility of completely accurate observations. "It is impossible to say that the state of a system can ever be accurately determined by measurement," and modern science has to be satisfied with predictions that have probability. "Science is thus no longer deterministic in character." The law of entropy is not an absolutely necessary law, and has only a highly probable validity. It is not absolutely certain that the universe will ultimately run down. If all processes in the world were somehow sometime to run counter to the law of entropy, past and future would be reversed—like a film running backward!

To readers of English there seems to be little in this brief book that has not been more fully and equally clearly presented in the popular works of such authorities as Eddington, Jeans, and Julian Huxley, who are firsthand investigators in these fields, as apparently Schlick was not. The translation reads well, and appears to have been conscientiously and accurately done.

WILLIAM K. WRIGHT

Hindu View of Christ, by Swami Akhilananda, New York, Philosophical Library, ©1949, pp. 291, $3.

This book is true to its title. It is a study of Christ and his religious significance in terms of Hindu categories. The author represents the Ramakrishna Vedanta Society, Boston. Deeply appreciative of Jesus as an Oriental, he undertakes an interpretation in an Oriental perspective, a task for which his former book on Hindu psychology has prepared him.

The outcome is instructive. Christ is seen as an incarnation of God, an *avatara* after the order of Buddha, the Krishna of the *Bhagavad-Gita,* and Chaitanya. He is a yogi of the highest type. vast in compassion, following the path of love (*bhakti*) predominantly, though he is also strong in excellent works (*karma*) and in unitive divine knowledge (*jnana*). He advocates spiritual practices to cleanse the heart and to integrate emotions, will, and thought. He exalts practice of religious ideals in everyday life. His power is of the spirit, not of politics or the sword. His cross symbolizes both his reliance on soul-force and his opposition to aggression. Easter is the symbol of his transcendence of physical nature. As a religious teacher he helps others to integrate their minds. His outgoing love for all men leads to sharing the values of religious experience, which is the basis of all true missionary work.

For Western readers unacquainted with Hindu ideas, this view of Christ may appear somewhat bewildering though suggestive. It is, in fact, largely the Christ of the Fourth Gospel assimilated to a Hindu pattern, and there is naturally no attempt to consider results of historical research into the beginnings of the Christian religion. Swami Akhilananda is loyal to his expressed purpose to seek to establish harmony of religious ideals, and this necessarily passes by particularities on both sides which some may deem essential. However, there is no mistaking the deeply religious spirit of the book and the genuinely friendly attitude of its author toward Christians.

Fortunately, the reader is helped to understand the method and issues involved by the valuable Introduction written by Walter G. Muelder, dean of the School of Theology of Boston University.

For readers already familiar with Hindu thought the book has the value of throwing light on its concepts by showing them in application to well-known material in the Christian religion. On the whole the procedure emphasizes contemplative, spiritual, and mystical elements which activistic Western Christianity tends to overlook. That is good, although the synoptic vision of both Eastern and Western interpretations is doubtless necessary to give full depth to our view of Christ.

CLARENCE H. HAMILTON

Gregory of Tours, by William C. McDermott, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1949, pp. xi, 109, $2.50.

Readers of CROZER QUARTERLY will recall with interest the article on that sterling churchman, Gregory of Tours, contributed by McDermott to Vol. XXI (1944), pp. 277-292. Here he follows with a fresh and lucid translation of a few selections judiciously chosen from the minor works, now appearing, for the most part, for the first time in English. Though the accompanying introduction and notes—the latter happily each on its apposite page and not, as so often nowadays, relegated to an easily-ignored appendix—amply demonstrate McDermott's mastery of the whole of Gregory's work, his decision rather to whet our taste than to glut it with repetitious hagiography may prove to be a wise one. This little volume of far greater significance than its size would imply, will, when taken with the splendid translation of the history of the Franks published by O. M. Dalton in 1927, provide the reader without Latin with sufficient apparatus to give him a full picture not only of the mind of Gregory, who was no theologian, but also of life in Merovingian Gaul, a period so different from our own except, perhaps, in the frequency of violence.

After a series of eight prefaces which seemed to the reviewer the least rewarding section of the book, the reader arrives at a translation of the whole of the first book of the work known as *The Miracles of St. Martin the Bishop*. Here the nineteenth bishop of Tours, in a hagiographic style characteristic of the writer and of the age, details the miracles performed by his predecessor, the fifth bishop, both during his lifetime and afterwards. The historian of the mediæval church will find therein a remarkable eyewitness account of a pilgrimage to the shrine of St. Martin in which Gregory personally participated and was among those cured. Next comes a pair of biographical sketches, the first of St. Gallus of Clermont, the second of St. Gregory, bishop of Langres, both of them closely related by blood ties to Gregory of Tours, though he here modestly refrains from mentioning it. There is also a most interesting version, translation, adaptation, of the famous story of the Seven Sleepers of Ephesus, derived (with help) from an earlier hagiographic document in Greek or, more probably, Syriac. Curiously enough, this account overlooks entirely the possibility that in the approximately two centuries during which the martyrs remained in a state of animated suspension, the language of Ephesus might have changed to the point of unintelligibility. Finally, there are two lists by Gregory of the Seven Wonders of the World, Christianized and modernized, in which the writer shows how deeply the world had changed since the end of antiquity and how slight his acquaintance with ancient lore.

Though this book is small, it is veritably a *multum in parvo*, and most readers who cannot read the Latin originals will doubtless gain a true and accurate appreciation of the few flowers in the vase.

This is the fourth volume in the third series of *Translations and Reprints from the Original Sources of History*, revived in 1941 by the late John L. LaMonte. In the light of the recent announcement that McDermott himself has been appointed LaMonte's successor, we can rest assured that the high standard reached by his predecessor will be maintained.

G. E. MC CRACKEN

The Atoning Life, by Henry Sylvester Nash, New York, Harper, ©1950, pp. 105, $1.

The presiding bishop of the Episcopal Church has chosen for his annual lenten book a volume that was first published nearly a half century ago, a volume that has long been out of print, but one which to those who have read it is a remarkable statement of the deepest meaning in the Christian life. In order to make the book available to a large public today, Dr. Sherrill has selected it for 1950; the reader will have little doubt concerning the wisdom of the choice.

Dr. Nash had a long and memorable career as professor at the Episcopal Theological School at Cambridge. He wrote little, but his influence upon his students was extraordinary; in this little volume, we can see why this was so.

What is Christianity? It is relationship to God, says the writer. The Christian has "a personal relation to an infinite, holy, and creative will which is at work within his nature, building him up in the divine likeness." "Salvation is one's own achievement, because salvation is God's achievement wrought out within the working and struggling will of man." "God's saving Word to man comes to men only when they have taken on themselves a complete personal and social obligation." In Christ's humanity "we see the Deity," working out an "atoning life" which is "a meeting-place between God and man." And in that Christ, "man sees his will taken up into the mystery and unity of the divine will." Then man can give himself to his fellows, "by living in them and bearing their burdens." This is our heritage, and we enter into it by entrance into "the creative unity of God in Christ."

It is along these lines that Dr. Nash works out his theme. The astonishing thing is that it is all so contemporary. Or perhaps it is not astonishing at all. Perhaps the fact is that authentic Christianity is all of a piece, so that what was true and truly contemporary at the turn of the century is also true today, because it is always true. This is a book to read and to ponder; it will make our own conviction stronger and clearer, and it will point the way towards significant Christian action, for the Christian, as Nash tells us, is one who having put his "being into the corporate being of the Church of Christ" actually lives "the atoning life."

W. NORMAN PITTENGER

Les Églises en Allemagne (*The Churches in Germany*), by Edmond Vermeil, K. J. Hahn, and Gabriel Le Bras, Paris, Librairie Marcel Rivière, 1949, pp. 118, 200 francs (distributed in America by Columbia University Press, $1.25).

These essays were prepared for the foreign policy associations of France and the Netherlands for conferences held in 1947 and 1948. The Rockefeller Foundation was the sponsor. The views expressed were those of the authors. Vermeil was responsible for the section on the evangelical churches in Germany (pp. 11-62), Gabriel Le Bras for the introduction to the Roman Catholic section (pp. 65-73) and the findings (pp. 99-118), and K. J. Hahn for the Roman Catholic section itself (pp. 77-95).

In summary, the argument is that the result of the Reformation was a spiritual unity in which both Protestantism and Roman Catholicism shared and that this religious fervor could be turned toward political objectives, as for example in 1914

and 1939, because the government had supported ecclesiastical education and social action. Moreover, Germany's international relationships will always be seriously conditioned by its churches.

The German people throughout their history have deified both God and country. Lutheranism escapes from its environment by emphasis upon the life of God in the soul of man and is therefore externally subject to political pressure. The state may be wicked but must be obeyed. Luther himself illustrates this dualism, for up to 1525 he emphasized faith but thereafter the church and the state. Hence, he is the principal fact in German history, and Lutheran dualism the main event.

Hahn observes that 1870 was the parting of the way for German Catholicism. The tradition of the "Holy Catholic Empire" then fades, with Protestant Germany growing stronger and stronger and Catholic Germany looking longingly to the West for help.

On the question of war guilt the discussion limps a bit. The Concordat between Pius XI and Hitler is overlooked; Von Papen's salute to it forgotten: "The Third Reich is the first power in the world not only to recognize but to translate into practice the high principles of the Papacy. . . . We stand at the beginning of a Christian Revolution."

This much, at least, is admitted, namely, that as early as 1946 it was evident that only a slight minority of both Protestant and Catholic Germans desired the democratization of their country, that the division of Germany is not approved by the evangelical churches, that democracy cannot be imposed on the German people, that a totalitarian Catholicism now in the saddle is colliding and will collide with the German national ideology, that a spiritual revival is not immediately in store for Germany, that German Catholicism is not promoting the international aspects of Roman Catholicism, and that the German people are not falling in love with the allies.

As a tract for the times, these essays may have served a useful purpose. But their superficiality and triteness deprive them of enduring value. Weinel's article on *Volksreligion* in *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart,* (Vol. V, pp. 1617-1623) gives a much clearer perspective and the *Friends' of Europe Publications,* London, of presecond-world-war days a hundredfold greater amount of data and insight into the German problem. S. W. Baron's *Modern Nationalism and Religion* is suggested to all foreign policy associations, American, European, and Asiatic, as prescribed reading if they would ever understand the complicated problems, apparent and hidden, in the writing of peace treaties. It is a tragic aspect of contemporary international policy that atomic and hydrogen bombs are discussed day and night and so little attention bestowed upon the remote historical roots of the questions we would solve. *But the roots remain!* The readers of the present volume should balance these hopes and fears against the very different statements by the European Catholic, Otto B. Roegels in *Orbis Catholicus* and the *Commonweal* (December 9, 1949, p. 269).

CONRAD HENRY MOEHLMAN

Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum, by Guido Kisch, Notre Dame (Ind.), University of Notre Dame, 1949, pp. vi, 277, $4.50.

This most interesting document stems from a Hebrew original written not, of course, by the great Philo of Alexandria whose name it bears in the manuscripts but by an unknown Jew resident in Palestine in the period A.D. 70-100. At an early date some Christian appears to have thought enough of it to translate it into Greek,

and this Greek version in turn was in the fourth century rendered into Latin, the only one of the three versions now extant.

The reader should not be misled by the title: there is nothing in this ancient book that smacks of "antiquities" as that word is now used. Instead, it is an apocryphal account of the early history of the Jews, beginning with Adam and ending abruptly with the death of Saul. The author has, of course, borrowed largely from the Sacred Scriptures but has naturally condensed much, omitting, for example, the creation story, the patriarchs in general, and the entire priestly code and Leviticus. On the other hand he has added considerably from material found elsewhere, the largest expansion being in the section devoted to the period of the judges where there is a long tale recounting the deeds of Cenez or Kenaz, here made a son of Caleb. Even where the two accounts are parallel, the details are often quite different. The purpose appears to have been "to interest and edify the reader and, from a religious point of view, to strengthen his belief in God's providence and in the high mission of Israel." The work has "many roots in the ancient Jewish traditions and legends upon which the Haggadah and the Midrash are founded," but shows not the slightest trace of a knowledge of Christianity. It comes, indeed, from the same school that produced the Fourth Book of Esdras and the Apocalypse of Baruch.

Though Pseudo-Philo was known to several mediæval writers, modern scholars have given him relatively little attention. Except for Leopold Cohn who made the detailed philological analysis leading to the conclusions summarized above, and M. R. James who examined some of the British fragments and published an English translation in 1917—there is also a German version by Paul Riessler (Augsburg, 1928)—almost no one has studied this work up to the present. For the Latin version scholars have hitherto had to be content with the *editio princeps* of Johannes Sichard (Basel, 1527) or one of its four reprints, the last of which appeared as long ago as 1599, all five now exceedingly rare.

It was therefore high time that a critical edition be published, together with a sound introduction and detailed exegetical commentary dealing with the many difficulties with which every page bristles, and most desirably, an English translation, all within the covers of one book. Kisch, however, has unfortunately not seen fit to give us that kind of edition. There is no translation, no exegetical commentary, and the introduction, though voluminous—106 pages of the 277—is limited so far as exegesis is concerned to a condensation of Cohn's results, with no claims to an advance in this respect.

The emphasis laid by Kisch is critical. He has had access to the important Admont and Melk manuscripts of the eleventh and fifteenth centuries, respectively, both since 1936 the property of Howard L. Goodhart, of New York City. These two *codices* Kisch carefully collated with the text of the *editio princeps* and with the little which is known about other manuscripts, in an effort to arrive at a sound text, the results of the research being stated with a lavishness that is usually reserved for the greatest masterpieces of ancient literature. Had the editor been able to do as much for the other manuscripts as he has done for Admont and Melk, we should indeed have had the definitive edition that is desired, but the war prevented the realization of his good intentions. As it is, Kisch has in the main given us the data needed for the establishment of a text greatly improved over those of the sixteenth century, rendering the two translations now obsolete, since he has been able to restore the text of a great many lacunæ, though not of all of them. There is still a very bad break in 9:12 where the mother of Moses, Iacobe (Jochebed, Exod.

6:20; Numb. 26:59), as the text now stands, *abscondit eum in utero suo per tres menses*. If the agents of the king of Egypt were at that point able to detect the sex of the unborn child, they were superior to the best of modern physicians!

Kisch's printed text has, however, it seems to me, been based on faulty textual principles, the most elementary of which requires the editor to print the best text possible. This Kisch's devotion to the Admont readings has prevented, for, despite the general superiority of Admont to Melk, it is not always better. As a result, we often find the undoubtedly correct reading in the *apparatus criticus* and something impossible in the text, *e.g.*, the meaningless *sepem* in the text (p. 209) and the correct *septem* (from Sichard) in the notes. Moreover, the decision to follow Admont implicitly has resulted in rendering the Latin diphthongs *œ* and *æ* by *e* and, usually—there is at least one exception which may be an error of Kisch's—the digraph *ti* by *ci*, giving the text a curiously mediæval appearance which a fourth-century work should not have.

The accuracy of the editing may be tested by a comparison of the text and notes with the photographs of the initial *folia* of the two manuscripts. Here we find two instances where undoubtedly superior readings of Melk are not even recorded (*Philo* for *Phylo; Zanath* for *et Anath*); one place where both *codices* have *ad Claudium* and the text *ad Cladium;* one instance where the reading of Melk appears to be credited to Admont, and vice versa; and several other differences between the two of less significance. For the material subjected to this examination—not quite a page for Admont and a little more than two pages for Melk—this number of inaccuracies is somewhat disturbing. Yet the reader who can patiently dig out the material consigned to the notes and compare it with the text will in most cases doubtless be able to reach a fairly sound reading.

The book is beautifully printed by the Abbey Press of St. Meinrad, but there are some misprints which did not get noted on the *errata* sheet: *millenium-old* (p. iii), *Aggrippinæ* (p. 16), *Jan* for *Jean* (p. 102), *six* for *sex* (p. 134), and the date of the first edition of Trithemius' *De Ecclesiasticis Scriptoribus* should be 1494, not 1512 (p. 22).

GEORGE E. MC CRACKEN

Melville's Use of the Bible, by Nathalia Wright, Durham, Duke University Press, 1949, pp. 203, $3.50.

The appearance of a book about Melville and the Bible seemed inevitable. His star has been slowly rising, and sooner or later someone becomes interested in the relation of a great writer to the Bible. It is a natural tendency on the part of most people to be cautious in their approach to such a book. It often is so Victorian. Let it be stated at once, then, that Miss Wright's book is not of this sort; she has a broader view of her task. As long ago as 1940 she published "Biblical Allusion in Melville's Prose" in *American Literature*. The present volume may be read with confidence and will be read with interest.

To be sure, there are figures that tell of quotation and allusion (1,400 of the latter; about one in seven pages of prose and one in four pages of poetry—see pp. 8-10 for these and other statistics), and there are other figures that tell the story as it is found in the marked portions of his personally used Bibles now in the Harvard College Library and the New York Public Library. Her chief concerns, however, are in terms of imagery, characters and types, themes and plots, and style, which are among the chapter titles of her book.

Here she shows that Melville's interests were not those of either doctrine or personal religious experience, but of a literary nature. He was attracted to massive

objects—kings and gods—to the antique, the marvelous, the spectacular, and the miraculous; and he liked scenes of violence and destruction. Thus, his use of the Bible was "beyond quotation and allusion, beyond allegory to true inspiration" (p. 19) in a real sense. In this way he had no need to depend upon his reader's knowledge of the allusion for its effectiveness. He was so saturated with biblical stories, ideas, language, and style that he seemed to be writing in his own idiom. This appeared even in his personal and private journal and letters.

His use of the Bible was not due to his admiration for it as a source of material, but to the fact that here was a volume that expressed his own personal traits of character and thought; it spoke to his condition. He did not submit its pages to the critical analyses of the historian and the linguist. There was for him something deeper and more vital than either of these could find. This was not the fundamental devotion to a supposed revelation beyond the critics' power of discovery, but rather the simple acceptance of a literary work of genius that was evidence for the contention that myth is a record of the basic character of man and so has a spiritual value superior to that of history. For this reason he has few actual quotations from the Bible, and his allusions are more like overtones of its influence. He does not bear down heavily upon his scriptural indebtedness, but with a light hand and an individual touch avoids the melody for the more attractive accompaniment.

Such a volume as this serves a double purpose. It offers a thorough study of its proposed field of inquiry, and it reveals an area of biblical influence that is worthy of more serious attention on the part of those who would undertake further studies in related subjects.

ROBERT E. KEIGHTON

Religious Art, by Émile Mâle, New York, Pantheon, ©1949, pp. 208, $4.50.

Between the years 1931 and 1941 there appeared four large volumes that comprised a critical history of religious art from the twelfth to the eighteenth century. The author has now selected the portions he believes most significant, provided connecting passages, and issued the result as the present volume. It is one of the most interesting and revealing studies of the art of that period.

Mâle is primarily a French Roman Catholic and writes from that point of view. This is not to say that the book suffers from his bias, but rather to applaud a study of religious art that has the value of being the product of sensitive appreciation rather than the questionable merit of merely objective analysis. Furthermore he lays principal stress upon sculpture, but this is due to his conviction that Gothic cathedrals are encyclopedias of human knowledge and experience, and that "in the domain of art, the greatest achievement of France was the cathedral" (p. 98).

The author offers as an aid to understanding the cathedral the parallelism of the *Speculum Majus,* that stupendous compilation popularly attributed to Vincent of Beauvais. Here one finds the mirror of the mediæval mind out of which came the cathedrals and their sculpture—art that was purposely dogmatic and didactic, a book of instruction for all those who could see. His thesis is strengthened by the character of art after the Council of Trent, when "It became the auxiliary of the Counter Reformation, one of the aspects of apologetics, defending what the Protestants attacked—the Virgin, the saints, the papacy, images, sacraments, works, and prayers for the dead. It developed themes which in the past had been only sketched; and it expressed sentiments and forms of devotion which were entirely new" (p. 198).

During these centuries, says Mâle, art was the interpreter of the religion of the period. In the twelfth century it was monastic; in the thirteenth century it was a serene art; in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries it became passionate and mourn-

ful, even to establishing "the cult of death." Thus religious art during these four centuries was influenced by the world out of which it came, a world of liturgical drama, pilgrimages, illuminated manuscripts, and literature both devotional and secular. Such a presentation of religious art is not only invaluable as information, but indispensable as inspiration. If it seems to be limited to a narrow span of years, it is not so limited in its principles and implications. What the author says is important and convincing; what he implies is a necessary tool of the sincere and serious student of all religious art.

ROBERT E. KEIGHTON

Jacob Boehme, by Hans L. Martensen, revised by Stephen Hobhouse, New York, Harper, 1949, pp. xxxiii, 200, $5.

Jacob Boehme (1575-1624), the Silesian shoemaker, who was also a devout Christian, practical mystic, and metaphysical philosopher, has been a mystery to many. The reading of the present study by Hans L. Martensen, Primate Bishop of Denmark, who published his study of Boehme in 1882, which is here revised with added notes and appendices by Stephen Hobhouse, will not substantially alter the mystery for many readers. The extreme metaphysical speculations of Boehme, in which he claims to push aside the veil of mystery until he can wisely interpret the nature of reality, will disturb many. He finds the basic reality in the *Ungrund,* the primal, preexistential freedom that lies even deeper than God. Indeed, God himself comes to birth out of the *Ungrund,* so that Boehme believes there is a theogonistic process, a process of divine birth or genesis. God, accordingly suffers birth and grows, an idea which to most Christian minds is unacceptable. Martensen is especially critical in his treatment of Boehme's thought at this point, contending that "the Personal God, the God of Goodness, is, from the outset, the absolutely real; He does not develop Himself from incompleteness to completeness, from potentiality to reality, but is absolutely perfect from the beginning" (pp. 77 f.). The reader will also be mystified by the process through which God uses nature for the shaping forth of his glory. The process is described by Boehme as containing within it the seven natural properties which represent the form-giving, nature-fashioning energy of the universe. These seven natural properties are introspective desire, outward-looking desire or movement, rotation, lightning, wisdom, intelligible sound, and the essential. All of this sounds involved enough, but the picture is greatly complicated by Boehme in that he holds that each of these natural properties has a symbolical expression. These are, respectively, salt, mercury, sulphur, a cross, water and spirit, tone, and salnitter (probably salt-nitre). When any of these concepts is used by Boehme, he is referring to the vital force at work within nature. Thus his readers are in constant need of jumping from concrete symbol to active force and metaphysical significance. All of this will prove quite baffling to the ordinary reader.

Yet it should not be assumed that there is nothing of value in Boehme and this particular treatment of his thought. One will find a religious ruggedness about the Silesian shoemaker which will refresh one's spirit. His theory that man the creature must develop himself from nature to spirit, from outwardness to inwardness, from a fettered to a free condition, his insistence upon the Triune God as the God of goodness and eternal love, his stout insistence that the life of faith is inseparable from a mighty moral and spiritual transformation within—these and other emphases will make the volume rewarding for the reader who is not unduly attracted by Boehme's proclivity for metaphysics.

The present volume should be regarded as a companion volume to the author's *Selected Mystical Writings of William Law,* published in 1948. The author's dis-

closure of Berdyaev's indebtedness to Boehme is also of importance to the student of contemporary theology. GEORGE W. DAVIS

The Ministry, edited by J. Richard Spann, Nashville, Abingdon-Cokesbury, ©1949, pp. 208, $2.

One of the chief concerns of mid-century Protestantism as it faces American secularism and world upheaval is the quality, training, and effectiveness of its ministry. If the free churches are to bear their full gospel witness in this crucial hour, at home and abroad, they must have the best leadership available. The book under consideration is a hopeful sign of the times, and a valuable contribution to studies by denominational secretaries and seminary professors.

Based upon the twenty-ninth Annual Conference on Ministerial Training at Evanston, Illinois, the volume represents the mature wisdom of seventeen eminent Protestant churchmen, each an authority on his special subject. Part I, "The Minister's Prerequisities," deals with his qualifications, call, background, preparation, and supreme task. In Part II, "The Minister's Work," the following aspects are considered: the minister as preacher, priest, comforter, counselor, religious educator, leader of people and program, and director of public relations. Part III is concerned with "The Minister's Personal Life" and treats of his health, ethics, temptations, study, home life, and higher compensations. The chapters are uniformly of a high order with little overlapping, and the total impression is one of unity, comprehensiveness, intellectual honesty, and spiritual persuasiveness.

Here is a "refresher course" for busy pastors, where they may measure their preaching by the insights of Ralph W. Sockman, test their pastoral counseling by the suggestiveness of Otis Rice, and find illustrations and references without which, alas, too many parsons find a book unworthy of their attention. The entering theological student will find the book valuable for orientation, a worthy companion volume for *The Romance of the Ministry* by Raymond Calkins. Seminary professors might read this study with profit, and likewise laymen. The section of the background of the minister by Murray H. Leiffer is based upon case studies which reveal that in one denomination the typical candidate comes from "a congenial type of background," so far as his denominational college and home are concerned and represents "a cross section of the church membership." One might wish that more candidates came from the lower and higher brackets of American life, with degrees from state universities. It is encouraging to note that many GI's are entering the ministry, not a few of whom have had scientific training.

From a reading of the book it does not appear that the addresses were set in the framework of our present world disorder with its racial tensions and religious apathy. Nor is there extended reference to the ecumenical trends, social pronouncements, and missionary strategy of contemporary Protestantism. Perhaps such developments were implied, or dealt with in an introductory lecture which is not published. The foreword of a dozen lines simply states that "the requirements of the Christian Minister are more varied and exacting than they have ever been in the history of the Christian Church," and then passes on to a statement about the contents. If the competent editor had overcome his modesty and had written a longer foreword concerning the actual world in which a minister must do his work, it would have brought a sense of urgency which the book, for all of its worth, does not quite possess. Too often the chapters are more hortatory than provocative, conventional than challenging, descriptive than dynamic.

Only one chapter has a bibliography appended, that of Seward Hiltner on the health of the minister. Perhaps the uplift of these oral addresses will provide the

necessary stimulus for further study. Certainly the probing by Elton Trueblood in his discussion of the minister's study habits will reveal intellectual ailments, and the insistence upon high standards of achievement by all the lecturers will save many pastors from laziness and complacency.

Seminaries today, faced with large enrollments, are more conscious than ever of the necessity of selectivity, the need for ordering the curriculum to provide the proper balance of content and practical courses, the value of a supervised interneship for advanced students, and the significance of certain psychometric tests which reveal the relation between an emotional "call" and actual academic and field work achievement. Much hard thinking has yet to be done in the field of ministerial training if the Protestant churches are to have the vital leadership so desperately needed. Gratitude is due the contributors to this volume, and especially to the able editor.

VAUGHAN DABNEY

Treatise on Values, by Samuel L. Hart, New York, Philosophical Library, ©1949, pp. 165, $3.75.

What is considered a very modest aim by the author: "to clarify value-concepts, to understand their objectivity, relativity, as conditioned by shifting physical and social factors, and to comprehend that there cannot be any other court of appeal than experience adjudicated by reason"—this is the warrant for this book. What this really means is an expanded treatise on values as completely determined judgments—which although prolific in their variety and immutable in their origin, blossoming, and fruition, are never substantial in their essence. Or to put it critically—as the author far too frequently does—any idea of value which does not yield totally to an explicable milieu of determinant factors (all the way from great-grandfather's liking for snuff to your wife's gullibility for sales promotion) is manifestly nothing more than metaphysical indulgence, foolish speculation, unwarranted assumption, or just plain assininity.

With this in mind one can readily appreciate the immediate banishment of Plato and his ilk from the scene (except as a well-plugged target) and the equally rapid and open-armed welcome given to the apostle of instrumentalism, John Dewey. In language precise and yet not cold, Dr. Hart reveals an erudition no one could criticize; yet with it there is a rather obvious scorn for anyone who believes there are powers operating in this universe beyond the ken of academic knowledge and outside vindication by logic. The constant repetition of the melody, page after page, —positively and negatively and sometimes discordantly with little or no illustrative material—leads one to judge the work as reactionary in its attempt at correction. The basic argument is valid, especially in the light of much superficial and fuzzy thinking on this subject; yet there is no need even here for militancy and all of its accompanying brood of expediences. To plead so steadily for the philosophical principle of identity and yet to insist that all moral values are relative and all religious values peripheral seems to be an unnecessarily high price to pay for the truth that values divorced from human experience are meaningless and not worth having.

The first chapter—what values are—is excellent. The second—what values are not—is completely unnecessary. The discussions of moral and religious values (areas in which the subject has its greatest implications) are not as amply done as one has a right to expect. If the student desires provocative opinions, this treatise will gratify him. The layman, however, will be left unmoved, indifferent, and even more firmly intrenched in his conviction that scholars need to walk the earth to see the heights.

ROBERT D. HERSHEY

BOOK NOTICES

Best Sermons: 1949-1950 Edition, edited by G. Paul Butler, New York, Harper, ©1949, pp. xxii, 325, $3.

Dr. G. Paul Butler has edited another book in the series of best sermons. He is religious editor and book reviewer for a New York newspaper. This edition includes sermons from Catholics and Jews as well as Protestants. The advisory committee for Protestant sermons was Dr. Paul E. Scherer, Dr. Joseph R. Sizoo, and Dr. Ralph W. Sockman. The sermons included in this book were selected from a total of 6,585 submitted. Many of the "Best Sermons" hear the names of familiar and famous ministers, but some from younger men are also included. Among these latter are Ansley C. Moore, Presbyterian of Pittsburgh; Liston Pope, new dean of the Divinity School of Yale University; Warner L. Hall, Presbyterian of Charlotte, N. C.; and Edwin Hughes Pruden, Baptist of Washington, D. C. This volume will certainly compare favorably with the previous ones. Dr. Joseph R. Sizoo has said of the last volume, "By all odds the finest group of sermons that has ever been put together." Here a minister can find and better understand the approach which the abler men of our pulpits are taking in dealing with modern issues. Unquestionably samples of great preaching are included. It is likely that this volume will be on the assigned list in every seminary for students in classes on preaching. These sermons are outstanding in both content and style. Each writer was allowed to express himself without restraint in accordance with his faith so long as no criticism against another religion was made. There are sermons in this volume which will catch the attention of people from all walks of life, which will challenge young people, and which will prove inspiring and instructive to preachers. The sermons included in this volume are classified under such headings as the following: adoration, the Bible, the Christian life, the church, evangelistic preaching, Easter, faith, forgiveness, freedom and responsibility, God, justice, labor, man, national and international issues, personal and racial problems. After reading this volume one is reassured. While there may be a great deal of poor preaching, there is also some good preaching in our pulpits today. Perhaps there is more able preaching on the whole in this century than during any previous Christian century.

JAMES HOUSTON IVEY

Psychology and Religion for Everyday Living, by Charles T. Holman, New York, Macmillan, 1949, pp. xi, 178, $2.50.

Charles Holman was one of the first to link the insights of dynamic psychology with religion, and he remains one of the best. The current volume belongs with Fosdick's *On Being a Real Person* and one or two others of the past ten years as dealing most helpfully and honestly with this subject for the lay reader. There can be little originality about the list of subjects of the inner life to be considered in such a volume. The meaning of growth at a human level, the significance of fear, moods, date, conscience, habit—the topics are given. The author makes no pretensions to profound reinterpretation of them. His effort is rather to bring together insights from both fields to illuminate the inner life for the ordinary reader. If this book can be said to have faults, they lie in two directions, but it is by no means certain they are defects, in a work of this kind. This reviewer does believe it is possible to deal with a deeper level of ideas about, for example, fear, and still retain a lay reading

public. But so far as the author goes, he is correct. The other point is that a hortatory note creeps in from time to time. Whether this is essential in homiletical material is a moot point, on which there is not general agreement. The virtues of the book are great, by no means the least of them being the author's own spirit—combining a certain intellectual toughness completely unintimidated either by ancient dogma or scientific discovery, with a humility and sensitivity to human beings and human problems in particular. It is acquaintance with this spirit which may support an intellect on the verge of moving toward reaction, or an emotion tempted to despair.

SEWARD HILTNER

T. S. Eliot: A Symposium, edited by Richard March and Tambimuttu, Chicago, Henry Regnery, ©1949, pp. 259, $3.50.

At the outset, I should make it clear that it is not possible to review this book in the ordinary sense of that term. T. S. Eliot has had far too much influence on the literary life of the past three decades to allow one to dismiss any new book by, or about, him, with a few perfunctory lines. To quote William Empson in the present volume, "I do not know for certain how much of my own mind he (Eliot) invented." That sums up the situation for almost any writer of Eliot's own generation, as well as for those who have followed in later years. We approach Eliot as the purifier of our poetic heritage—the poet, who more than any other, gave form to a departure which brought poetry back to its origin in tradition, while opening a door to subsequent forward movement. I do not think that it would be possible for any contemporary poet to write intelligently without first acknowledging, at least to himself, the profound influence which Eliot has had, and still possesses. This applies equally to Americans, Europeans, and Asiatics, as the many and varied sources of this tribute for his sixtieth birthday will bear witness. Certainly the list of contributors to this symposium is an impressive one: There are statements by such early contemporaries as Conrad Aiken and Wyndham Lewis. There are poems—good ones—by W. H. Auden, Edith Sitwell, and Stephen Spender. There are critical essays by Ashley Dukes and Marianne Moore. Finally, there are tributes to Eliot's influence on poetry as a common heritage by such distinguished Europeans as Mario Praz and George Seferis, by such Asiatics as Bishnu Dey and Amalendu Bose. There is nothing of the forced or occasional in any of these pieces. The great and near great have come together to pay homage which they feel deserved, and their combined effort may become a monument of its type.

THEODORE V. ENSLIN II

Prayers and Meditations, edited by Gerald Heard, New York, Harper, ©1949, pp. 153, $2.

Group worship, when repeated by the same person over a period of time, tends to formulate itself into a representative pattern. From such a group comes this book, the results of their corporate and cooperative experience. The materials are arranged in a monthly cycle of subjects moving from adherence, being, and awe, to time and eternity. For each day there is a series of prayers, the first one of which is always a composition based on the apostrophes of Dionysius the Areopagite, followed by a meditation and concluding with other prayers. The prayers are mystical in character and the meditations are in the same spirit, although the latter approach an everydayness that sometimes becomes even colloquial and earthy. This combination provides a serious and commanding idea in a vivid, contemporaneous setting. Designed for use in the evening to assist the reader to reflect upon some aspect of the spiritual life during the following day, these "offices" for either individual or corporate worship

will prove very useful for those who wish to give validity and significance to their devotional experience. ROBERT E. KEIGHTON

Triumphant Personality, by Robert Clyde Yarbrough, New York, Macmillan, 1949, pp. xi, 104, $2.

One approaches a book with a title such as this (particularly the subtitle: "Suggested Paths to Great and Noble Living") with due caution. There is no dearth of books, large and small, being ground out by the publication mills these days admonishing us to "relax our way into personal integration and salvation." The glib handling of the word "personality" by scores of would-be physicians of the soul is enough to make the average reader shudder. Mr. Yarbrough, however, is not to be classed among these evangelists of the "gospel of pretense and relaxation." His treatment of the age-old problems of handling life's troubles, despairs, and fears makes for delightful reading and affords the reader an opportunity to make a sound and realistic appraisal of himself. The brief chapters, such as "Making the Most of What You Have" and "Growing in Spiritual Maturity," are presented in such an easygoing homiletic fashion that one almost has the sneaking suspicion that spiritual and mental defeats are, after all, quite superfluous. In this respect the book offers a somewhat thin treatment of these "thicker" problems of life but, by and large, poses a very workable answer. I cannot understand why a book of this kind and scarcely over 100 pages should exceed a dollar in price, but that is a publisher's problem and not a reviewer's. It will undoubtedly make a contribution to the personal religious life of the layman. O. EDWYN LUTTRELL

Knowing and the Known, by John Dewey and Arthur F. Bentley, Boston, Beacon, 1949, pp. xiii, 334, $4.

This book, published on October 20, 1949, the ninetieth anniversary of the birth of John Dewey, consists of chapters that had appeared as separate articles in philosophical journals during the past four years. While Dewey has outlived most of his disciples, all contemporary American philosophers revere him as the most eminent philosopher of our time and country, and nearly all acknowledge indebtedness to him in different ways. The appendix to this book is a letter written by Dewey to a young student who was seeking an explanation of Dewey's theory of knowledge. It is perhaps the clearest short explanation that Dewey has ever given of the basic principles of the "theory of inquiry" contained in his *Logic,* published in 1938. Chapter X of the book now under review, entitled "Common Sense and Science," is an interesting and characteristic essay by Dewey, and contains little that he has not said before. What is new in the remainder of the volume seems to be chiefly, if not wholly, the contribution of Bentley. In Chapter I Bentley attacks opposing contemporary American logicians—Carnap, Cohen and Nagel, Ducasse, Lewis, Morris, and Tarski. Chapters II-VII appear to be introductory to Chapters VIII, IX, and XI, in which Bentley sets forth an exact and elaborate vocabulary for Dewey's logic which ought to make the writings of the Dewey school more precise and consistent. This vocabulary, however, has a different tone, somehow, from Dewey's own writing. It seems rigid for a fluid philosophy like Dewey's instrumentalism, and to be more in the style of scholasticism. WILLIAM K. WRIGHT

The Cambridge Platform of 1648, edited by Henry Wilder Foote, Boston, Beacon, 1949, pp. 119, no price.

This paper-covered volume records the addresses given at the anniversary gathering in memory of a very significant event and document in American church history.

Three centuries ago the churches of the United Colonies of New England sent representatives to Cambridge to work out what has become the classic statement on congregational polity. This form of church government rules the largest number of Christian believers in our nation today. It is, of course, a platitude that New England church life in its governmental aspects helped signally to prepare the way for our American Republic. Perry Miller's important essay here tells us that it was not until more than a century had passed that the Cambridge Platform came into its own as a prophetic statement on democratic government, and that it was two centuries before "the full-blown idealization of the Platform as a pioneer prophecy of democracy and the Bill of Rights" and "seedbed of civil liberties" took place. It is clear that the Platform needs careful reading, and that we must not romantically read our own thoughts into it, or overestimate its importance as a primary source of political enlightenment. But granting all this, the Cambridge Platform is yet a document of the first importance in the history of church government, the classic statement on the autonomy of the local congregation, gathered and governed by Christ. The Congregationalist, Frederick L. Fagley, writes competently "The Narrative of the Cambridge Synod." The Unitarian, Henry Wilder Foote, weighs its "Significance and Influence." The other long addresses are by Perry Miller and Roland Bainton. The event and the booklet might have had a more representative character had Baptists and Disciples, of the same school of polity, taken part. Of the several briefer addresses, that of Harvard's President Conant is notable and timely, engaging himself as he does with living issues concerning war and peace. I wondered why the editors did not include the Platform itself. But Walker's *Creeds and Platforms of Congregationalism* needs forty-three close printed pages to cover it, and that might turn into seventy-five in the page style of this new booklet. Bainton's informative and perceptive essay helps us to see the New England Theocracy in its wider setting. I close by quoting him: "The external lineaments of their holy commonwealth have perished, yet a spiritual heritage survives and if over the outward structure we must write the word 'failure,' then one should add that the failures of history in the eyes of God are more significant than the successes" (p. 86).

JOHN W. BRUSH

The Philosophy of Personalism, by Albert C. Knudson, Boston, Boston University Press, 1949, pp. 438, $2.75.

The present volume was first published in 1927 and is now reissued in its earlier form. Out of print for a number of years, this book has taken rank as a standard work in the literature of personalism. By personalism, the author understands "that form of idealism which gives equal recognition to both the pluralistic and monistic aspects of experience and which finds in the conscious unity, identity, and free activity of personality the key to the nature of reality and the solution of the ultimate problems of philosophy" (p. 87). This philosophy, instead of being confined to modern thought, is ancient and enjoys a steady emphasis in the philosophies of the ages. Wherever there is a theism, there is an implicit personalism. Hence personalism is no philosophic "sport." On the contrary, its roots grow back into the thought of Plato and Aristotle and spread into varying expressions in such philosophers as Plotinus, Augustine, Thomas Aquinas, Descartes, Leibnitz, Berkeley, Kant, Hegel, Lotze, and Borden Parker Bowne. With Bowne personalism receives systematic methodological expression. He it was who "took the idea that personality is the key to reality and made it the central and organizing principle of his entire philosophy." The book is recommended to those who desire intimate and critical acquaintance with the personalistic approach to reality. In its field it is without a peer.

GEORGE W. DAVIS

Missions at the Grass Roots, by William P. Shriver, New York, Friendship Press, ©1949, pp. vi, 170, $1.

Written under the direction of the Missionary Education Movement of the United States and Canada, an agency of coöperation through which the boards of home and foreign missions and of Christian education from twenty-eight denominations unite to facilitate the work of missionary education, this compact volume repeatedly stresses the geographical immediacy of home missionary work. No matter where the Christian lives, there is missionary work of a pioneering kind to be done. Wherever there is a social and religious need, there is the area of home missions. Where are such areas of need to be found? The ringing answer of the author is "everywhere." "There is a frontier at the door, a mission at the grass roots" (p. 161). Such is his thesis and his conclusion. These modern areas of need are found wherever there is the need of developing community, in the developmnt of a church which makes the entire community the centre of its Christian concern, in meeting the needs of youth and old age, and in creating Christian coöperation to care for the needs of all the people in the community. Hence the modern home mission is not on any distant geographical frontier, but on the frontier of need at our very door. Every Christian can be a pioneer in this brand of mission work. The book offers an excellent study course for home missions. It should prove provocative to groups which use it in the church, inspiring them to become actively missionary in their thinking and action.

GEORGE W. DAVIS

Trustees of Creation, by William L. Muncy, Jr., Philadelphia, Judson, ©1949, pp. 93, 60 cents.

This study of the scripture teachings concerning stewardship was prepared by Professor William L. Muncy, Jr., of the Central Baptist Theological Seminary, at the request of the Committee on the Stewardship Advance of the Northern Baptist Convention. It is intended for use in connection with that movement now in progress in the churches of the Northern Baptist Convention. As the subtitle ("a study of the scripture teachings concerning stewardship") indicates, the various positions taken by the author are abundantly buttressed by scripture quotations and references. While dealing for the most part with stewardship of property, it does treat to some extent the spiritual implications involved in the use of the entire resources of the human being, including time, opportunity, and talent. It will no doubt contribute to the success of the stewardship advance.

HOWARD WAYNE SMITH

Etched in Purple, by Frank J. Irgang, Caldwell (Idaho), Caxton Printers, 1949, pp. 237, $3.50.

In this particular phase of a postwar period which we are now experiencing too many of the erstwhile "brass" from all branches of the services are glutting the readers' market with glowing accounts of their much-heralded activities, much of which proves quite ordinary and far from revealing war's truthful portrait. It is very refreshing to discover a book which records the memoirs of war's greatest hero, the enlisted combat infantryman, for if we must read about war, let's get it from the man who really knows! Ordinarily he doesn't wish to talk about it, but there is something providential in that one of them who has seen action as a combat medico until thrice wounded, then to return as a combat scout, should reveal so graphically the picture of war as actually seen by the foot soldier. Here is no pretension toward literary art or greatness, but merely the recording of what happened, dispassionately noted with little emotion or comment, so typical of one in his "calling." Frank Irgang

has no ax to grind, only a story to tell. He betrays his sympathies for the enlisted man, the rank injustice of medal distribution, his undisguised contempt for the apathy of those at home and who had not shared the front lines; but these are all minor refrains which every soldier feels. Apparently this book was not written as a crusade against war, but it speaks a mighty argument in that direction. From the opening pages as you land on Omaha Beach with Irgang, you are aware of the detached and impersonal character of war which seldom reaches the reader. As Mr. Irgang casually describes death in its varied, monstrous forms upon those who surround him through the months as he fights from Normandy into Germany, it is only the presence of the completed book which reassures the reader that even this one man could survive. More ghastly, perhaps, is the effect which such experiences have upon the mind of him who writes. We see the transition from the unarmed messenger of mercy into the calm determined killer. None who read dares point an accusing finger, for out of the experience of reading this book will come an alarming sense of the personal responsibility and guilt which falls upon each citizen as an individual perpetuator of so heinous a system which so frequently is unleashed upon the youth of the world.

ROBERT B. ROSE

Contemporary Thinking about Paul: An Anthology, compiled by Thomas S. Kepler, Nashville, Abingdon-Cokesbury, ©1950, pp. 442, $4.

Professor Kepler, of Oberlin, recently published an anthology, *Contemporary Thinking about Jesus*. He has now given us a similar volume for Paul. The passages, chosen from modern writers on the subject, represent a wide range of scholarship, including fifty-six authors, all the way from K. Lake to Karl Barth. The old-fashioned liberals are here, and so are the new-fashioned neoörthodox. The book opens with a series of selections illustrating the "Religious Atmosphere of Paul's World." Edwyn Bevan's pages on the mystery religions and Christianity from *The History of Christianity in the Light of Modern Knowledge* are here, together with Professor Willoughby's mystery initiation from *Pagan Regeneration;* so are several pages from H. A. A. Kennedy's *St. Paul and the Mystery Religions,* and seven magnificent pages from George F. Moore's *Judaism*. Part II is entitled "Biographical Data: The Man and His Experience," with a similar wide-ranging series of passages —from Hans Lietzmann to Jack Finegan. Part III deals with the letters of Paul; Part IV with "Insights into Pauline Theology," and Part V with "Modern Evaluations of Paul." The book has all the values of an anthology, and the limitations. It will whet the student's appetite for more, and will introduce him to the great modern treatises on Paul and Paulinism. In the present appalling book-famine, when students simply cannot obtain copies of some of the most essential modern theological works, Professor Kepler's anthology may well serve as a substitute for the full treatises.

FREDERICK C. GRANT

Personalities in Social Reform, by G. Bromley Oxnam, Nashville, Abingdon-Cokesbury, ©1950, pp. 176, $2.

This is a rather superficial study of five oddly assorted "social reformers," namely, Sidney and Beatrice Webb, Walter Rauschenbusch, David E. Lilienthal, Mohandas K. Gandhi, and Albert Schweitzer. A chapter is devoted to each. Bishop Oxnam tells us in the brief foreword that "these studies consider the place of personality in social reform and demonstrate . . . that man can lay hold upon scientific means to achieve moral ends." Each of these reformers, he thinks, "is grounded in an overmastering faith in God" and "each holds that there is a moral law binding

upon all." They all believe in the supreme value of human personality and "hold that personality can only flower in freedom." That they all mention God in their writings the author demonstrates, but that they all have the same conception of God or of God's will for man the author seems to assume rather than prove. That they all mean the same thing when they speak of freedom the author again assumes. He quotes at great length from the writings of these reformers but makes no attempt to go beyond the printed words to the essential meaning, and in no sense is his book an analysis of their philosophy.

JOHN H. HALLOWELL

The Philosophy of Civilization, by Albert Schweitzer, New York, Macmillan, 1949, pp. xvii, 347, $5.

This is a one-volume American edition of *The Decay and Restoration of Civilization* and *Civilization and Ethics* originally published in England in 1923. They are described as two parts of "a complete philosophy of civilization." So far as I am aware, the third part dealing with "The World View of Reverence for Life" and the fourth, "The Civilized State," have not yet appeared. In that I recommend the reading of the volume for itself, this notice is brief. Schweitzer considers the decay of civilization in our time to be its lack of a tenable *Weltanschauung* and *Lebensanschauung.* I get the impression that when he wrote the volumes he had already lost intellectual conviction in Christian theism. But he fails to give a satisfactory *Weltanschauung.* He confesses: "It remains a painful enigma for me that I must live with reverence for life in a world which is dominated by creative will which is also destructive will, and destructive will which is also creative" (p. 312). What he presents is a *Lebensanschauung*: a "reverence for life." Such a phrase is, however, altogether too vague and may be said to involve within it all the problems with which he was supposed to deal.

ALBAN G. WIDGERY

Albert Schweitzer: Life and Message, by Magnus C. Ratter, Boston, Beacon, 1950, pp. vi, 214, $3.

For several years now, it has been the fashion to publish books and articles of every description, and in every conceivable place, concerning Dr. Schweitzer's work in Africa and the extraordinary genius of a man who has taken the forefront in at least three distinct fields. Few would argue that Schweitzer is not a man of the highest rank; but his friends and admirers have done him as much disservice in their too strenuous acclaim, as was done through the denial of recognition which was his lot for many years. So far as this type of advertisement is concerned, the saturation point has been reached. The tenth book of *Recollections of Dr. Schweitzer,* even the tenth book of *morceaux choisis* collected from Schweitzer himself, falls somewhat flat after the preceding nine volumes have been circulated. I do not mean to detract from the real service that is being done in the reissue of Schweitzer's actual work—that is a debt long overdue—but the various anthologies and commentaries become wearying. Instead of more books of this sort, could we not have an adequate translation of Schweitzer's *Johann Sebastian Bach?* Mr. Ratter's book is pleasant enough so far as such things go; but, despite the publisher's blurb, there is nothing here that cannot be had from a dozen other sources.

THEODORE V. ENSLIN II

A Unitarian States His Case, by Robert W. Sonen, Boston, Beacon, 1949, pp. vi, 149, $2.

In New England, where American Unitarianism originated, everybody is personally acquainted with some of its supporters, understands their general position,

and respects them. However, when a person crosses the Hudson river, the farther he travels westward or southward, the fewer people he meets who have any intelligent notion about Unitarianism, and the more who are ignorantly prejudiced against it. This book, written by the pastor of the church in Tulsa, Oklahoma, explains in a clear conversational style the spirit of Unitarianism. It stands for "free and honest thought." Every member is at liberty to defend whatever position he chooses upon any religious topic whatever, provided only that he is tolerant of the different opinions of others. The local churches are completely autonomous congregations without any centrally governing authorities, or any obligatory creeds; their services may be (but of course seldom are) as elaborately ceremonial as in an Anglo-Catholic cathedral, or as informal as in a Friends' meetinghouse. Unitarians find something of which they can approve in almost every religious position, not excepting Agnosticism, Epicureanism, and Stoicism, with a discussion of which three this book begins. Upon such a subject as immortality almost every conceivable position is held by some members. A man of character has a feeling of reverence for the things of the spirit—beauty, truth, justice, goodness. Eager study is made of the problems of education, labor relations, the nature of God, prayer, the Bible. Christmas is celebrated joyfully. Most members probably feel further apart from the Christian tradition at Easter than at any other time, and more in accord with Socrates and Plato. There will always be something for men to do in this imperfect but improvable universe, and hence a favorite hymn says:

> Creation's Lord, we give thee thanks,
> That this thy world is incomplete.

WILLIAM K. WRIGHT

After England—We, by A. H. Maloney, Boston, Meador, ©1949, pp. 183, $2.50.

The lands of the Caribbean region include 318,000 square miles, and on them are supported eleven million people. The author champions their desires for freedom from foreign exploitation and for some kind of self-government. The meaning of the mysterious title is clarified in his statement that it is often heard in Caribbea. Among the subjects considered are education, the press, labor, economic planning, recreation and health, prejudice and religion. Much information is made available in numerous tables of statistics. A more impressive case would have been made for the highly laudable aspirations of the oppressed peoples of Caribbea if the author had approached the cause with greater objectivity. So impassioned is he as to be frequently incoherent and not a few times irrelevant. Reading this book is not easy or rewarding; the effect is a little like impromptu preaching played back on a wire recorder. And it would be more appealing if the spelling were less original.

HARMON M. GEHR

The Life and Time of Jehudah Halevi, by Rudolf Kayser, New York, Philosophical Library, ©1949, pp. 176, $3.75.

Throughout this little book there is a moving undertone freighted with individual and racial suffering, frustration, and hope. Halevi (1086-1167), the central character, a Spanish Jew, lived through the second crusade, and, as had his ancestors for generations, suffered grievously from both Christians and Moslems. He was a gifted poet, writing in both Arabic and Hebrew. A physician, skilled in the knowledge of his day, he gave himself without stint to all who needed aid. A scholar, versed in Greek and Arabic philosophies, he insisted that the rôle of reason was limited to natural law, and that rabbinic orthodoxy, like Greek philosophy, was quite inadequate for religion. A mystic, he "had God in his heart" and insisted that

apart from an inner experience there was no proof for either religion or for God. A theologian, he held that the Law of Moses was a supernatural revelation, for what all the people saw and heard at Sinai could not be false, and the ten commandments could not be the product of reason. The Hebrews were the chosen people, their history was divine, their land with their city, different from all other lands, was holy. All—soil, law, and people—were vitally united and were caught up in God; all were supernatural. Palestine and Jerusalem, apart from which Judaism would have had no existence, were to him the abiding symbols of the higher and the invisible realities. To their ancient land God would bring his people back only when they had repented. Yet so significant had the symbols become to him that in his old age he made a pilgrimage just to feel the dust of the ancient landmarks. Tradition says he was assassinated in the holy city. The author quietly indicates that Halevi and his contemporaries were not dreaming of a political state, but were thinking in terms of pure religion (pp. 98, 152). The book is valuable as a declaration of supernaturalism, and as a warning.

I. G. MATTHEWS

One Man's Testimony, by Norman Goodall, New York, Harper, ©1949, pp. 128, $1.50.

This may very properly be "one man's testimony," but it is quite likely to strengthen the testimony of many others, who, like him, have had the events of the last generation assault their faith in Christianity. The testimony is in the form so characteristic of British churchmen: the main traditional tenets of the Christian faith are still held, although the manner of their present relevancy conforms to the age in which they are held. "Christ is the centre and soul of my Christian conviction," he writes (p. 120), and one reader would add that the excellent chapter on the church ("The Fellowship of Grace") is an important key to the structure he has built around the centre. The more men live and write—and the more men read this kind of spiritual pilgrimage, the better our age will be.

ROBERT E. KEIGHTON

The Best of John A. Hutton, edited by Edgar DeWitt Jones, New York, Harper, ©1950, pp. xiv, 176, $2.

Preaching from a text is not so popular as it once was; expository sermons are not generally so well received. Biblical preaching would gain stature if it were after the manner of Hutton. His sermons are based solidly upon the Bible, but the superstructure is the house we live in. When he writes, "Perhaps . . . for an entire generation we preachers should be forbidden to do anything but expound the beauty and the truth and the tragedy and the desperate hope with which the Bible labors in travail to give us such a faith as man may have in God" (p. 14), we are more than half inclined to agree with him. But that is while we are hearing him preach. In our private moments we know that we should need his exquisite taste in language, his insight into the realities of experience, and his nice balance of observation and imagination. Edgar DeWitt Jones has put us deep in his debt by editing this book of inspiration and challenge. If, after reading these sermons, a minister never even tries to preach one like them, he still could not help preaching better than he did before.

ROBERT E. KEIGHTON

Human Rights, a Symposium, edited by UNESCO, New York, Columbia University Press, 1949, pp. 288, $3.75.

The provocative and diverse interpretations of human rights which make up this book were written in answer to a questionnaire sent out by UNESCO to a number of

outstanding philosophers and thinkers of member states of UNESCO. The enquiry was stimulated by the preparation of the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* which the General Assembly of the United Nations issued in 1948. The first group of essays deals with the general problems of human rights. Some consider special phases such as the right to education, the rights of dependent peoples, and science and the rights of man. Others discuss human rights in accordance with cultural traditions; *e.g.,* the Hindu concept of human rights, the Islamic tradition, and human rights in the Chinese tradition. As one would expect from such independent thinkers as Jacques Maritain, Harold J. Laski, Benedetto Croce, and Aldous Huxley, to name only a few of the contributors, widely different points of view have been expounded. These testimonies will provide the reader with plenty of food for thought. Although the *Universal Declaration* has been issued it cannot be the final word on a subject so fundamental to the well-being of man. Therefore, the speculations and interpretations collected in this volume may well form the basis for later modifications of the document. The text of the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* is included in an appendix.

HARLAND A. CARPENTER

When the People Sang, Marie Pierik, Boston, McLaughlin & Reilly, 1949, pp. 32, 50 cents.

Despite the title which recalls a type of nostalgia all too common in small brochures of this sort, the author has managed to cover the history and use of Gregorian chant, from its earliest beginnings, to the present day, remarkably well in so tiny a compass. The general history is treated first, after which there are sections devoted to the individual history of each part of the Mass. If this pamphlet serves its purpose and reawakens general interest in the original unaccompanied chants, it will have accomplished far more than the various scholarly volumes which miss the readers for which this one is intended.

THEODORE V. ENSLIN II

Introduction to the Devout Life, by St. Francis de Sales, translated and edited by John K. Ryan, New York, Harper, ©1950, pp. xxix, 256, $3.

"Next to the *Imitation of Christ,*" says the jacket, "the *Introduction to the Devout Life* has been the most popular devotional book to come out of Christianity." That may be true. It is certainly one of the books of Catholic devotion most acceptable to Protestants. The Catholic world essayed various imitations of *Pilgrim's Progress.* The editor of this volume in our hands tells us that an Anglican rector in 1701 prepared a "special edition" of Francis' work "that would not be offensive to Protestants." Happily we have gone beyond such tactics. The devout Protestant will love this book for what it is. Two great Catholic saints bear the name of Francis, and both are worth knowing. One is the roadside saint, friends of birds and beasts and beggars. The lesser known is the Alpine French bishop, man of advanced culture, frequenter of courts and palaces. He died in 1622, was canonized in 1665, and made a doctor of the church in 1877. Gentleness marks both these saints. De Sales is not of the company of Pascal, Kierkegaard, Dostoievsky, and Blois, "wrestlers with God." There is no joint loose in his thigh. He is the seasoned and serene counselor of the common-sense and the natural, unforced ascent to God. He writes for the layman who has no time for protracted monastic vigils or ascetic marathons. He is indeed a genius at illustration, though for modern taste the perfume of the *précieux* often detracts. This edition is externally attractive, and the translation is good. Open the French edition, for example to Chapter II, and find the phrase, "l'union amoureuse de Dieu." In an older translation in my library it reads: "Amorous union with God."

Surely Ryan's is better: "union of love with God." The scholarly reader will be grateful for the editor's notes (pp. 231-251) on the text.

JOHN W. BRUSH

Gospel Parallels: a Synopsis of the First Three Gospels, edited by Henry J. Cadbury and others, New York, Nelson, © 1949, pp. xii, 191, $2.50.

Here we have a very useful tool. For nearly sixty years students have come in increasing numbers to consider Huck's *Synopse* the most convenient harmony of the Greek gospels. While other good harmonies were available, the arrangement initiated by Huck presents the material with the least distortion and is of a nature to make the volume by all odds easiest to use. Since 1936 it has been available in an English edition for those who could not use German. Now the present volume substitutes an English text for the Greek of Huck, and with the same section numbers, with the result that sudents who cannot use Greek can have the advantage of this workable format. Teachers who have had to conduct "bilingual" courses will know personally the emotion of long-delayed joy which Simeon is said to have felt. The translations employed is that of the new Revised Standard Version. A modest amount of textual information is unobstrusively presented, while parallel or related passages from quotations preserved from various noncanonical (apocryphal) gospels are conveniently assembled as in the Greek Huck. Naturally final judgments as to the merits of such a volume—its accuracy and the like—will have to be deferred until it has been thoroughly tested over a sustained period of actual use. So far as I can see from a reasonably close examination, it is to be rated A1, and I am already prescribing it in my own classes.

MORTON S. ENSLIN

In the Beginning, by Solomon Goldman, New York, Harper, ©1949, pp. xiv, 892, $5.

This, the second volume of what is to be a "multi-volumed work," styled *The Book of Human Destiny,* has the book of Genesis as its basis. It is a potpourri of story, translation, background, criticism, style, philosophy, and indices. These pages often suffer from the personal prejudices of the author, almost a traditionalist, and an ardent Zionist. The major section of the book, more than six hundred pages of quotations, relevant and irrelevant, is adequately described in the caption "Echoes and Allusions."

I. G. MATTHEWS

BOOKS RECEIVED

**The Peshitto of Second Samuel,* by Donald M. C. Englert, Philadelphia, Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, 1949, pp. 102, $1.

**The Perennial Scope of Philosophy,* by Karl Jaspers, New York, Philosophical Library, ©1949, pp. 188, $3.

**Value: a Cooperative Inquiry,* edited by Ray Lepley, New York, Columbia University Press, 1949, pp. 487, $6.

**Millennium and Utopia,* by Ernest Lee Tureson, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1949, pp. xiii, 254, $3.50.

**Forgotten Religions: a Symposium,* edited by Vergilius Ferm, New York, Philosophical Library, ©1950, pp. xv, 392, $7.50.

**American Democracy and Natural Law,* by Cornelia Geer LeBoutillier, Columbia University Press, 1950, pp. 204, $3.

Self-Deceit, by Frederick Faber, Wallingford (Pa.), Pendle Hill, ©1949, pp. 47, 35 cents.

**Preaching the Miracles of Jesus,* by Hillyer H. Straton, Nashville, Abingdon-Cokesbury, ©1950, pp. 223, $2.50.

**Signs of Hope,* by Elton Trueblood, New York, Harper, ©1950, pp. 125, $1.

**The Bible and Modern Belief,* by Louis Wallis, Durham (N. C.), Duke University Press, ©1949, pp. xiii, 176, $2.50.

**Disaster through Air Power,* by Marshall Andrews, New York, Rinehart, ©1950, pp. xv, 143, $2.

**Leaves from a Russian Diary—and Thirty Years After,* by Pitirim A. Sorokin, Boston, Beacon, 1950, pp. ix, 346, $3.50.

**The Great Redemption,* by Chester Warren Quimby, New York, Macmillan, 1950, pp. ix, 213, $2.50.

**Christ's Victory and Ours,* by Frederick C. Grant, New York, Macmillan, 1950, pp. 85, $2.

**Growth in Prayer, by Constance Garrett,* New York, Macmillan, 1950, pp. viii, 156, $2.

**Eternal Values in Religion,* by James Bissett Pratt, New York, Macmillan, 1950, pp. viii, 162, $2.

**The Living God,* by Armand Pierhal, New York, Harper, ©1950, pp. 118, $1.75.

**The Mystery of the Charity of Joan of Arc,* by Charles Péguy, New York, Pantheon, ©1950, pp. 216, $3.

**As a Mighty Stream,* by Julian Morgenstern, Philadelphia, Jewish Publication Society, 1949, pp. x, 442, $4.

**A Commentary on the Creed of Islam,* by Sa'd al-Dīn al-Taftāzāni, translated by Earl Edgar Elder, New York, Columbia University Press, 1950, pp. xxxii, 187, $3.75.

**The Apostolic Fathers: an American Translation,* by Edgar J. Goodspeed, New York, Harper, ©1950, pp. xi, 321, $3.75.

**Early Christians of the 21st Century,* by Chad Walsh, New York, Harper, ©1950, pp. 188, $2.

**The Epic of Russian Literature: from its Origins through Tolstoy,* by Marc Slonim, New York, Oxford University Press, 1950, pp. vii, 367, $5.

**The Popes and Heresy in the Thirteenth Century,* by Albert Clement Shannon, Villanova (Pa.), Augustinian Press, 1949, pp. ix, 148, n. p.

**Geschichte der neuern evangelischen Theologie,* by Emanuel Hirsch, Gütersloh, Bertellsmann, 1949, pp. 1-160, DM 7.

The first two installments, each of eighty pages, of the five-volume work scheduled to be completed in the course of the next four years. We plan to run reviews as the several volumes are completed.

**Chapters in a Life of Paul,* by John Knox, Nashville, Abingdon-Cokesbury, ©1950, pp. 168, $2.50.

**Flagellant on Horseback,* by Richard Ellsworth Day, Philadelphia, Judson, ©1950, pp. 253, $3.

A Casket of Cameos, by F. W. Boreham, Philadelphia, Judson, ©1950, pp. 271, $2.

Twenty-two sermons upon texts, each of which is said to have been the acknowledged "molding and inspiring factor" in the life of an eminent man or woman.

**Enduring Satisfaction,* by William P. McEwen, New York, Philosophical Library, ©1949, pp. xxiii, 370, $4.75.

**On Being Your Best,* by G. Curtis Jones, New York, Macmillan, 1950, pp. xiv, 129, $2.

You Can Change the World, by James Keller, New York, New American Library, pp. 189, 25 cents.

Human Destiny, by Lecomte du Noüy, New York, New American Library, pp. 189, 25 cents.

The Christian Demand for Social Justice, edited by William Scarlett, New York, New American Library, pp. 126, 25 cents.

Those who did not read these three best sellers when they appeared can now read them in the *Signet Book* pulps.

**Nature and History,* by Sterling P. Lamprecht, New York, Columbia University Press, 1950, pp. xii, 155, $2.50.

**Joseph Haydn,* by H. E. Jacob, New York, Rinehart, ©1950, pp. xv, 368, $5.

**Zwingli and Cranmer on the Eucharist,* by Cyril C. Richardson, Evanston (Ill.), Seabury-Western Theological Seminary, 1949, pp. 57, 25 cents.

**The Gospel in Hymns,* by Albert Edward Bailey, New York, Scribner, 1950, pp. xx, 600, $6.

**Relativity—a Richer Truth,* by Philipp Frank, Boston, Beacon, 1950, pp. xvi, 142, $2.

**Christianity and Society,* by Nels F. S. Ferré, New York, Harper, ©1950, pp. viii, 280, $3.75.

**A Firm Faith for Today,* by Harold A. Bosley, New York, Harper, ©1950, pp. 283, $3.

**The Reformation of the Churches,* by James H. Leuba, Boston, Beacon, pp. xiii, 219, $2.75.

**Drawing-Room Conversion,* by Allan W. Eister, Durham, Duke University Press, 1950, pp. xiv, 236, $3.50.

The Person and Work of Christ, by Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield, Philadelphia, Presbyterian and Reformed, 1950, pp. 575, $4.50.

The second volume in the projected reprinting of the voluminous writings of the scholarly Princeton professor who labored valiantly for sound theology and who died in 1921.

**Eschatology and Ethics in the Teaching of Jesus,* by Amos N. Wilder, New York, Harper, rev. ed., ©1950, pp. 223, $2.50.

**Outline of a Metaphysics,* by Franklin J. Machette, New York, Philosophical Library, ©1949, pp. xv, 108, $3.75.

* To be reviewed.